

Fifty years on the firing line ...

Fifty Years on the Firing Line BY JAMES W. WITHAM

My Part in the Farmers' Movement BY "The Cornfield Philosopher"

Chicago PUBLISHED BY THE AUTHOR c19242

HD 1484 .W75 Copyright, 1924 BY J. W. WITHAM ALL RIGHTS RESERVED *Printed in the United States of America* APR-2 '24 ©CIA778689

CONTENTS

9-5-24

CHAPTER PAGE

I My Early Life 1

II My Early Life—Continued 9

III My Career as the Western Rambler 15

IV A Great Statesman 20

V Origin of the Farmers' Alliance 24

VI Fight in the Iowa Legislature 35

VII Some Interesting History 44

VIII Farmers' Organizations 58

Library of Congress

IX I Move to Minnesota 74

X My Career as The Cornfield Philosopher 83

XI I Attend Legislative Sessions 102

XII Some Legislative History 116

XIII Some Economic Subjects—Concentrations of Wealth—Taxation 142

XIV My Final Lecture 145

XV Some Jokes 156

XVI Some Progressives I Have Met 161

APPENDIX SOME CHAPTERS ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW

Preface 175

I Primary Information 177

II Duties of the Chairman 181

III Rights and Duties of Members 186

IV Motions 189

V Privileged Motions 193

VI Decorum 195

VII Committees 199

Library of Congress

VIII Voting Methods Explained 204

IX Rules 207

X Miscellaneous Matters 211

1

FIFTY YEARS ON THE FIRING LINE

CHAPTER I MY EARLY LIFE

I was born about sixty-eight years ago in a long cabin in Morrow County, Ohio, and in Bennington Township. The exact location of this cabin I never knew.

My very early boyhood was spent in a cabin situated about one-half of a mile directly east of the now thriving town of Marengo, in the woods, on a farm then owned by one Ebenezer Moorhouse. A stream of water known as the "Big Walnut" or more familiarly as the "Big Belly" came down from the north and crossed the Moorhouse place. A smaller creek from the east, which I think we called the "Little Walnut," with the larger one a short distance to the southwest bordering a camp of sugar maples. Here I learned to fish and swim, and to hunt rabbits in the winter time, though I was always a very indifferent hunter.

My father worked around among the neighbors and spent his spare time making handles for axes and other tools, of which he was very found, and became quite skillful. My mother, in addition to caring for a large family, aided the people in sickness and sometimes did their washing.

I started to school when about seven years of age. The schoolhouse was located about three-fourths of a mile to the southeast, and the name of my first teacher was Nancy Jane Mellinger, a neighbor girl. I don't know what put it into my head, but I resolved to be the very "worst boy in the school," and proceeded to carry out that intention. Miss Mellinger

Library of Congress

bore with me for about a week, during which time I kept the whole school in an uproar by my cuteness and defiance. Her patience finally becoming exhausted, she caught me on Friday afternoon and administered a most severe castigation. She literally wore out all the whips she had in stock and I believe she said she wished she had more. I was strong and healthy and the result was more painful than dangerous. But, young as I was, the experience set me to thinking. I had heard somewhere that "the way of the transgressor is hard," and I decided then and there that breaking the rules of the school didn't pay, so I made up my mind that if I could not be the worst boy and carry out the part successfully, I would turn over a new leaf and try to be the best boy; I would go to the other extreme. I ever afterward tried to live up to this resolve when attending the common school.

I became at once very studious for so young a boy. We had very few books in those days. I had just one, the old McGuffey's Spelling Book. In the course of two or three terms I committed every word in this book to memory. Spelling schools were the rage in those times, and I remember going long distances to spell other schools down, and never lost out when my favorite speller was used.

Many years afterward, when in college at Oskaloosa, Iowa, a spelling match was arranged in which all the brag spellers of Mahaska County took part. I think there was 300 in number. When the ceremonies commenced, the 3 monitor, to my great joy, pulled out of his pocket a dog-eared copy of this same identical spelling book and proceeded to pronounce from it. Having the advantage of the others, the words and their forms all coming back to me, I carried away the prize, which I think was aa \$5.00 gold piece, the first one I had ever owned.

While living on this Moorhouse place I had two experience which I will describe, as they had a great influence in shaping my personal habits in after life.

One day a number of boys in the neighborhood, all of them older than myself, "chipped in," and bought a plug of dog leg tobacco. Each of them took a small bite and then gave

Library of Congress

it to me saying, "if I bit off a large piece and would chew it up and swallow the juice it would taste as good as maple sugar." Not knowing any better, I proceeded to follow these suggestions. Tobacco taken into the stomach is a rank poison and I was deathly sick. The pain was also fearful. I remember it yet. Well, that was the first and last tobacco ever taken into my mouth in any form. I wonder if this heroic treatment would have the same effect on others?

As another time, I think it was on a Saturday, I went on a fishing trip up the Little Walnut with a number of others. Two boys of the vicinity came down to the creek and told us their folks were all away but themselves, and if we would come up to the house, about a quarter of a mile distant, they would treat us to cake, pie and cider. Just imagine the effect of such an invitation on a lot of hungry boys! The way that cake and pie disappeared was surely a caution. In addition, the old man had a keg of had cider in the cellar, which was tapped and sweetened liberally with maple sugar, making a beverage fit for a king. I partook 4 with the rest of the boys, and I guess that I was only limited in these potations by my capacity. As the shades of night began to fall we started for home through the woods, going very slowly. A queer sensation came into my head, I thought the whole world was going round and round. I finally climbed to the top of a fence and then collapsed, falling off in a heap, unable to move, where I remained until morning. I was all alone.

I am naturally timid and the fear and the fright as well as the suffering of that eventful night will always be remembered. What if I had died there all alone and my body consumed by wild animals? Oh, the agony of mind I endured! This was the first and last beverage of an intoxicating nature that has ever passed my lips. That one experience was enough.

I also learned to read, and eagerly devoured every newspaper or book that I could find. When I was about nine years of age I remember reading to an admiring crowd the story of General Sherman's capture of the city of Savannah, Georgia, with 25,000 bales of cotton, which he presented to President Lincoln as a Christmas gift.

Library of Congress

We had then moved to another neighborhood about two miles a little west of south of the town of Cardington. When I was a year or so older I accidentally became acquainted with a minister of the Gospel, Rev. E. M. Bell, who lived on a 67-acre farm two miles out of town. He and his wife both took a liking to me and I to them. They had no children of their own, only an adopted daughter who was already married. We had a large family and I had nothing to do at home, so I would slip over to Mr. Bell's, a little over a half-mile through the woods, almost every day. I soon got to doing chores and helping him, 5 and he and his wife both took such an interest in me and my future welfare that I came to regard them as my real parents. My natural parents did not object, as they had enough other mouths to feed, and they knew I would not suffer through my acquaintance with the Bells.

Mr. Bell belonged to the United Brethren Church, which had a meeting house at Center, about one mile south of his home. When I was twelve years old, I took up my residence regularly with Mr. Bell. He fed and clothed me, and sent me to school at Center in winter, where I made rapid progress.

My folks moved up to Cardington, and when I was thirteen I went home and attended the town school part of one year, being classed in the intermediate grade. I remember my average grade at the examination was 98½ per cent, being exceeded by none and equalled by only one, Barto McConahey, whom some reader of this book possibly may remember. He was a poor orphan boy a year my junior. Poor Barto! How I would like to see him. I remember a few names of the boys in my class. There was Charley Reed, Lehman and Lurton Peck, Leslie Chase, Eddie Sanderson and Ward Tucker. The latter moved West and we heard he was killed by the Indians.

In 1869 I went back to Bell's and worked on the farm till the winter of 1870-71. I was then a lusty boy of fifteen years and could do a man's work, or at least I thought I could. I had intended to go to school again, but my father fell sick, so I went home and chopped cordwood all winter to support the family. It was a great trial to me and I often sat down on

Library of Congress

a log and cried over my hard lot, but Mr. Bell assured me that it was duty to do this under the circumstances.

6

I saved enough money and subscribed for Horace Greeley's great paper, *The New York Tribune*, in my own name. I early learned to take part in literary exercises and to debate. On Friday nights I usually went down to old Center and attended the literary.

The next spring I went back to Bell's and remained with him till the spring of 1872. He had given up preaching, divided up his land with his son-in-law, and was giving a home to his wife's brother. He thought, therefore, he did not need me, and I hired out to a neighbor, John Wesley Henry, for \$13 a month. The crops were not good and the first of August, Henry told me that he would have to let me go. I went over to Bell's and he wanted to adopt me, and he and his good wife, Harriet, and myself had a good cry together, when I suggested that I was "going West to grow up with the country," as Horace Greeley advised in his *Tribune*.

The truth of the matter was, that although but sixteen years of age, I had fallen most violently in love with a neighbor girl whom I had no prospects of winning or being able by remaining there to provide a home for her.

While living with Mr. Bell I had attended a farmers' picnic, where the speaker, an eloquent lawyer, had told the audience how very independent farmers were. I remember one sentence. He said, "You have the most devoted wives, the best-looking daughters, and the sweetest babies; you are kings in your own right and the most independent class of people on this earth." The crowd cheered him to the echo, and I believe they elected him to Congress.

Shortly afterward I went to town with the preacher with a load of grain. They had no telephones in those 7 days. The minister therefore did not know what he was going to get for his load until he reached the elevator. "I wish," said the grain dealer, "you had come

in last week. Grain is off 10 cents a bushel today," which was a loss of \$35 on the load. Pocketing this loss he went over to a dealer in agricultural implements and asked the price of a new mowing machine. The man said, "You could have bought this last month when you first spoke about it for \$40. There is prospect of a big crop of hay and the price has gone up to \$45," which he paid. These two transactions set me to thinking and I quizzed the old man on the way home until he was decidedly uncomfortable. I told him he was lucky that the elevator man hadn't cut down the price more and that the implement dealer hadn't asked him \$50 for the machine.

While living here another incident occurred which had a very decided influence on my after life. One very hot, dry day, while we were cultivating corn by the roadside, a man drove by in an open top buggy looking quite comfortable—I believe he said he had some ice in the vehicle—while we were sweltering in the intense heat. He said he was on his way to visit a sick farmer by the name of Smith. I saw him go by every day for a week or so. On an equally hot day, a short time afterward, another well-dressed man drove by, who, I was informed, was a lawyer going out to Smith's to write his will. Subsequently, when I failed to see the doctor go by, I asked what had happened, and was told that Smith was dead. What did the doctor get for his services and what did they pay the lawyer, I inquired. I was informed that the attorney got \$10 and the medicine man's bill was \$300. I had already learned that the farmer realized about \$1 per day for his hard 8 labor, and in great surprise I inquired how could these professional men earn ten and twenty times as much. I was told it was all a matter of education. Me for an education, I exclaimed. You may bet I'll never follow a plow all my life when by acquiring an education I can earn as much as the doctor or the lawyer.

CHAPTER II MY EARLY LIFE—Continued

In August, 1872, I was a big, lusty boy of sixteen, and as before stated I fell violently in love with a neighbor girl, who for obvious reasons shall be nameless here. Realizing that

Library of Congress

I could not provide a suitable home for her in that section by my own efforts, I decided to go West where the opportunities would be much greater for an industrious youth to get a start in life. The girl was very young, so I said nothing to her on the subject, although I subsequently wrote her of my plans, but received no reply, a fact which greatly cooled my ardor.

I went up to the town of Galion on a passenger train and caught a local freight for the West, passing through the city of Marion, the home of President Harding. In the caboose I found a Yankee commercial drummer, I think his name was Bartholomew, who talked sneeringly of farmers, and here on the 13th day of August, 1872, I commenced my defense of the men who toil on the farms and produce the food that feeds the world, and I have continued that defense to the best of my ability to this day.

I was only a presumptuous boy and he was a well-read man of some forty years. The train crew were greatly amused at my temerity. They listened attentively to our arguments pro and con. That first farmers' organization, the Grange, had recently been started by the veteran O. H. Kelley, and I defended the right of the farmer to join this movement. I claimed, indeed, I insisted, that the men 10 who till the soil for a living had just as much right to form a class organization to promote class interests as the bankers or lawyers had to form a similar organization for a like purpose.

I want right here to say a few more words in regard to this first farmers' movement. I need not go into it deeply, for books covering the matter completely may be found in every public library.

But the Grange was a grand organization, and did a most wonderful work. First of all it broke down in a large measure that mighty wall of political prejudice which adroit politicians had so skillfully built up between republicans and democrats. I am fully aware that the discussion of both religious and political topics were prohibited by the rules, but these rules were not always strictly observed.

Secondly, the members soon learned in the Grange that farmers had great interests in common, regardless of their religion or their views on the policy of reconstruction or the tariff. They soon discovered that since they obtained their living from the same source, that conditions favorable to agriculture would promote the common interests of all, while adverse conditions would have an opposite effect.

Among the first things that Grangers did was to unite their local purchasing power and buy family supplies at wholesale. The years 1872-73 were the years when farm produce reached its lowest level. In many sections of the West corn was burned for fuel. Nothing that came from the farm would bring remunerable prices, except possibly near the large cities. It was incumbent therefore to make the little money in circulation go as far as possible. Every Grange sent off orders to catalog houses at a saving of from 25 to 50 per cent over local prices.

11

In time this wholesale system of buying extended to farm machinery. But more of the Grange later.

I first landed in Edgar County, Illinois, near the town of Kansas, where I hired out at 50 cents per day to one Elza B. Hickey. He and his brother-in-law, John Fairchild, were both active Grangers, and the house was full of Grange papers which I read with great avidity.

Fifty cents a day was low wages for work in the hot month of August, and I soon connected these low wages with the low prices farmers were receiving for their products. Thirteen dollars a month would not enable me to soon provide a home for my loved one. I frankly wrote her of my intentions and of my poor prospects, following it up with several letters on the same subject. She never replied, and in due time I allowed the desire to ramble around the world to supplant the wish for a home.

Library of Congress

Belonging to this local Grange., which was held in a schoolhouse about four miles north of Kansas, was a very intelligent farmer-preacher, A. P. Foresythe, who was afterward sent to Congress from this district. Wm. McAdam was another leading member with whom I corresponded for several years. I may add that we also held a literary society in the schoolhouse, where we debated questions forbidden in the Grange.

The first of January, following, found me penniless in the town of Salem, Marion County, Illinois, then the home of Wm. Jennings Bryan, who was at that time a schoolboy some thirteen years of age. I had been cheated out of my earnings by a fraudulent advertiser in Michigan, who had promised to set me up in business. I found work chopping cordwood for a man named Tully, with whose son, Eldorus, I corresponded many years. Here, 12 too, the Grange was in evidence, and we talked Grangerism to the limit.

Early in the spring I went up to McDonough County and hired out to a man named Scott as a farm hand. He lived four miles south of Bushnell. Here, also, was a live Grange, presided over by one Ross Manley. I made application for a membership, but they decided that I being only a common farm hand, liable to change my vocation at any time, was not eligible to membership. They had a great Grange rally at Macomb during the summer, which I attended, and was entirely taken up with the address I heard. I then resolved that I would qualify myself for the same line of work. I do not remember the name of the speaker, but he was an active tiller of the soil.

In September I left McDonough County and went to Nebraska, locating at Glendale in Cass County, about five miles southeast of Louisville. I made home with E. S. Child and worked around by the day. Later I took up the job of canvassing for books and papers, which I continued until the spring of 1874.

An early publisher of Chicago was Horatio Nelson Fish Lewis, who edited a sterling farmers' paper called *The Western Rural*. This paper boldly advocated the Granges'

Library of Congress

cause. I commenced, in 1873, sending in communications under the signature of "Julius," which I continued for many years.

In traveling over the country I talked Grangerism to the limit, and advocated organization among farmers on class lines just as other classes, notably lawyers, bankers and doctors were organized, and for class purposes. I insisted that one class had just as many rights as any other class—no more no less—and if bankers could all belong to a bankers' association, to which no one seemed to object, then by the same token farmers had a right to join the Grange. I did not get any pay for this service, but I worked at it just as hard as though I did.

Mr. Child had taken a homestead in Frontier County, about 300 miles to the west, and as the trip would give me a chance to see the county I went along with him and drove his stock. There were several other families in the party and we made about thirty miles a day, resting on Sundays. I wanted to see a wild, blood-thirsty Indian I had read so much about, but my wishes in this respect were not gratified for there were none of that description in that section. The only ones I saw were some traveling beggars.

Mr. Child located about thirty miles northwest of the town of Arapahoe, on a stream the name of which I have forgotten, but they called their home "Afton."

In a week or ten days I left Mr. Child and started back afoot down the Republican River. An account of the trip is not necessary here, but I reached the old home place safely in due time. I took up my old quarters, Mr. Simmons, a brother-in-law of Mr. Child's, occupying the place, and worked around during the summer.

In the fall I thought I would try another Glendale, and moved to Glendale. Jefferson County, Iowa, and worked for an energetic farmer named Riley Smith. Later I cut cordwood for a family by the name of Graber.

Library of Congress

A literary society was held in the town of Lockridge nearby, and I and other woodcutters took an active part, I as usual defending the farmers' right to live upon the earth. This was a pretty rough company and I, with my puritan notions, had more or less trouble, but nothing of a serious nature. We had some heated arguments, but that 14 is about all. Still they made it decided uncomfortable for me at times. David Lowry, John Saltzman, Harry Coe and John Hawbaker are the boys whose names I remember, all of whom took part in the literary exercises.

15

CHAPTER III MY CAREER AS THE WESTERN RAMBLER

While staying at Mr. Tully's I saw a stray copy of a paper that largely influenced my life for the next few years.

The *Young Folk's Rural*, afterward changed to monthly, was the name of the paper. It was published at Chicago by a man named Lewis, and edited by Mrs. Annie R. White. Among its many good features was a department called the "Center Table" in which were published letters from its subscribers who were called "Tableites" or "Center Tableonians." This just suited me to a dot and I became a member under various fictitious names, among them Gustavus Adolphus, Simon Sykes, Funny Man, and finally The Western Rambler.

From writing to the "Center Table" it was an easy transition to personal correspondence.

My Arrival at Centerdale

The town of Centerdale, located in the center of Springdale Township, Cedar County, Iowa, furnished a large number of contributors to the *Young Folk's Rural*. I had exchanged letters with one of them who wrote over the signature of "May Myrtle." Early in April I directed my footsteps toward this place, traveling most of the way on foot. I found here an ideal community. Springdale Township, including the villages of Springdale and

Library of Congress

West Branch, had been settled by Quakers, mostly from Ohio, 16 and was now largely populated by this excellent class of people. While I foolishly appeared among them as a common tramp, wearing old overalls, yet they took me in and made me welcome. A man named George Lamborn invited me to stop with him over Sunday, an offer which I gladly accepted. A good old Quaker, Isaac Worrall, gave me a week's work tending mason. Samuel J. Irey then sent for me to help plow corn. I worked hard and faithfully, never indulged in any cuss words nor used tobacco in any form, much less an intoxicating liquor, and spent my spare time reading books and newspapers. Isaac Worrall and his good wife Rachel were as father and mother to me, permitting me to make their place my home when not otherwise employed. The same may be said of Samuel Irey and his good wife. Wm. Lamborn and his sons, Amos and Parmenas, and later, Thomas Fawcett, gave me work. John Ball, who owned and operated the grain elevator, gave me jobs on rainy days. Indeed I think I worked for about every farmer in the neighborhood more or less. The township claimed, or could have justly claimed the banner, for on a full turn-out it cast over 300 republican votes to about 25 for the opposition.

In time I had more than two hundred "Tableites" on my list of correspondents, many of whom in my ramblings I managed to call upon. The "Tableites" were indeed a superior class of young people, the very cream of each community as it were, and my association with them was extremely fortunate for me.

My writings attracted attention and wherever I found a reader of this excellent young people's paper I was sure to find a friend and was gladly entertained. If anyone 17 who knew The "Western Rambler" by chance should read these lines I would be pleased to hear from him or her.

They had a Grange nearby, but becoming suspicious of its being a democratic movement in disguise, the republicans let it die.

Library of Congress

While living here in this good community my determination to acquire an education and devote my life to the farmer's cause took definite shape. Two years previously, while staying in McDonough County, Illinois, as I have previously mentioned, the idea first came into my mind, but my roving disposition had interfered with my half-formed plans.

The local school that winter, 1875-76, had a very competent teacher in the person of Wm. Black. I made arrangements to board at Worrall's and attend this school. On Saturdays I generally unloaded coal for the station agent, J. G. Southwick. I studied all the common branches and made very satisfactory progress in preparing for my life work.

The next summer I worked partly for H. A. Curtis at Inland, in the eastern part of the county, and partly around Centerdale. In the winter I attended Bayliss Business College at Keokuk on the Mississippi, and learned how to write and keep books.

In the spring of 1877 I again worked around near Centerdale, making my home in the upper rooms of the depot with the station agent, John A. Tipton. There was a paper published at West Branch called *The Times*, and almost as soon as I reached Centerdale I began sending in communications under various signatures, Reporter "Truant" and finally "Sammy Snooks" were the names used. I 18 became quite well known under the latter *nom de plume*, as I used it for many years.

I was now ready for the preparatory department at least of a regular college, and where should I go? By a mere accident I selected Oskaloosa College, located at Oskaloosa, Iowa, a school under the control of the Disciples of Christ or Christian Church, where I "matriculated" and enrolled my name as a student at the beginning of the spring term in the year 1878.

I attended this college for more than two years, or until it was merged with Drake University of Des Moines.

Library of Congress

I returned, after school closed, to Centerdale, where I worked as a farm hand, and in December canvassed for *The Western Rural* and other periodicals. It is no part of the plan of this work to give the details of my struggles to acquire the much-coveted education which ended at Drake University in 1889. They are consequently omitted to save space.

It may be of some interest to learn how I got my eye teeth cut politically, which I will now relate.

In the fall of 1877, being barely of age, I saw a poster in front of the yard advising all to come to Downey to listen to a silver-tongued orator discuss politics on a certain evening. They had a big corn crop in that vicinity and corn was very low in price. The speaker said over-production was the cause of the low prices and consequently hard times, and he gravely advised the people to raise half as much the following season, and predicted that if they followed this advice they would get twice as much for the crop. This looked reasonable enough and everybody seemed to accept this view of things including the writer.

But a few miles north of us they had only raised a half 19 a crop. The next night he spoke up there and I was so enthusiastic that I followed him to this point. To my great astonishment and chagrin when he attempted to explain the cause of the hard times he said, "It is not the scarcity of money for there are millions of dollars lying idle in the banks ready to be handed out for farm products. If you want more money just double your crops."

This was just the opposite from the advice he had given the night before. Both statements could not be true as a general proposition any more than twice three can be both six and eight, but both might be false. The crowd that heard the speaker the first night religiously believed that he had spoken the truth and voted for him for that reason, but the other crowd supported him for the opposite reason. I was the only one who heard him both times.

I had been to school enough to know that both of those statements could not be true as a general proposition, or as he stated them, and I could not get away from a feeling that in both cases he deliberately intended to confuse and mislead the audience, yet I confess that if I had heard him only once, the first time, that like the others I might have accepted the view that over-production is ordinarily the principal cause of "hard times" when that condition prevails.

The argument that there is plenty of money to pay for all the products of labor at some price is equally convincing. This being true what cause have we to complain?

Later in my own mind I made up the following platform which in my weak way I have tried to follow.

20

CHAPTER IV A GREAT STATESMAN

In the fall of 1878, while attending Oskaloosa College, I became acquainted with Gen. James B. Weaver, of Iowa, the great populist. This is how it happened. In that year he was a candidate for Congress against one E. S. Sampson of Sigourney, the regular republican nominee. They held joint debates throughout the district. One of them at Oskaloosa.

It so happened that Mr. Sampson had a daughter, Leona, in school, who was engaged to one of our most popular students, O. J. Nugent. All of us college boys, out of respect for Leona and her affianced, went down to the hall to hear the mighty Sampson do up the loud-mouthed greenbacker, but we were grievously disappointed. Sampson was an intellectual pigmy by the side of General Weaver, and got nowhere in the argument. Weaver told the crowd, and proved his statements as he went along, how some shrewd financiers down in Wall Street, New York, had conspired to get control of the finances of the nation. He said they intended to perpetuate and increase the public debt, get control of the markets and in due time this conspiracy of bankers would absorb all the surplus wealth

Library of Congress

of the country if permitted to have their own way in shaping legislation. The general also came out strongly in favor of the regulation of railroads by law, then a comparatively new issue.

As might be supposed, he carried the audience with 21 him, being not only a master debator, but having the essential facts on his side. Preacher Bell of Ohio had taught me when a mere boy the great importance of that Scriptural injunction, "Prove all things and hold fast to that which is good." He said further, that in the end the right would prevail, for the omnipotent power of Almighty God is behind it. He related how many giant wrongs like slavery had existed for a time, and that their defenders had died in disgrace and been forgotten, while those who lead in the movement to abolish these iniquities had been honored and venerated.

The lessons that fell from his lips had sunk deep in my heart and had been treasured in my memory. Before taking a stand he said I should ask myself just two questions, is it right and is it expedient? I confess I was troubled in my mind.

The debate was the only topic of conversation in the college halls next day. I always took an active part in the literary doings and could not have escaped expressing an opinion even if I had so desired. I naturally wanted to defend Leona's father and accept his views, but as a young man with my life all before me, could I afford to take the wrong side of so vital a question? To make a long story short, after some hesitation I accepted the views presented by General Weaver, defended his position in college debates, voted for him on election day and had the satisfaction of aiding him in winning the battle. Having put my hand to the plow, I was not disposed to turn back.

Weaver was a statesman, pure and undefiled, with the highest degree of patriotism. However, he may have been a little crude in his methods. He broke with the republican 22 can party and abandoned it and antagonized it at the polls. It has always been a question with me whether or not greater results would have followed if the old-time greenbackers

Library of Congress

and populists had confined their activities entirely within party lines. Would it not be much easier to convert the majority of a party to new ideas that could be carried out by degrees within the party than to get on the outside and fight? Does it not require less sacrifice to make the contest within party lines and is there not at least an equal chance of success? I leave these questions to be answered by the reader for himself or herself.

It is true that the aggressions of the slave power called the republican party into existence by forcing all anti-slavery whigs and democrats to get together who were unable to accept the dictum of a majority of the Supreme Court that "a negro had no rights whatever that a white man is bound to respect." And they could not unite in either of the old with opposition to this doctrine as the dominant issue. It may be that the recent action of Congress in passing the Cummins-Esch Railroad Bill, guaranteeing minimum profits on old "watered stocks and bonds" of the railways, in addition to every conceivable expense, together with other measures of a similar character, may invoke such an issue that the people can only meet in the same way.

Time alone will determine. While the republican party had several planks in its platform on which Abraham Lincoln was elected President in 1860, yet slavery was the supreme issue, and the planks nearly all related to that subject.

It may be that in the near future the matter of transportation, most vital to the prosperity of the farmer, may call a new party into existence in order to bring about Government ownership and operation of the railroad and other means of communication.

I would welcome such a party.

24

CHAPTER V ORIGIN OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE

About the year of 1876, one Milton George, a prosperous farmer of Fulton County, Illinois, purchased the *Western Rural* of H. N. F. Lewis and also the *Young Folk's Rural*. Mr.

Library of Congress

George moved to a small farm in the suburbs of Chicago and took charge of the two papers. He employed an able writer named David Ward Wood to write editorials.

Mr. George gave me a sort of roving commission to represent *The Rural* in Iowa and published numerous communications from me under the signature of "Julius." Iowa farmers used vast quantities of barbed wire for fencing purposes and the wire trust advanced the price to the top notch. There was a small independent company at Des Moines, operated by a plucky fellow named Wm. L. Carpenter, who sold wire at 2 or 3 cents a pound below trust prices. The big Washburn & Moen Company claimed, or at least pretended, that Mr. Carpenter was infringing on their patents. I went down and investigated the concern, and on my report, Mr. George took up the fight for this independent company. This move made the paper immensely popular in Iowa and its subscription list grew to a health size. I was personally welcomed in many farmers' homes. I attended the state, and many county fairs, and reported them for the *Rural*.

At this time three big men, all living on farms, largely directed the agricultural affairs of the state. They were, "Tama Jim" Wilson, Henry Wallace, of Adair County, father of the present Secretary of Agriculture, and Coker F. Clarkson, of Des Moines. *The Iowa State Register* was the leading daily and weekly paper of the state. It is yet, for that matter, although under a different management. "Father" Clarkson edited an alleged agricultural department in the *Weekly Register* and talked every week through his medium to more than 100,000 Iowa farmers, many of them subscribers to the *Western Rural*. The big wire trust carried a liberal advertisement in the *Register*, and Clarkson, some thought, was influenced by this fact. While posing as a firm friend of the farmer, indeed as a sort of agricultural oracle as it were, he published an article advising farmers not to patronize the independent wire concern. He afterward claimed that he did not prepare the article, but it was published without signature in his department of the paper. Everybody thought he wrote it as they had a right to think. Other members of this joint coterie of farmer defenders, Wilson and Wallace, came to Clarkson's assistance. Here was a plain issue between Clarkson and the *Rural*, and the paper's Iowa representative, who is "Julius,"

Library of Congress

a common Cedar County farm hand. It was asked that he set up his argument against Clarkson supported by Wilson and Wallace. In the end, Carpenter continued in business and big fellows were compelled to lower the prices on barbed wire, thereby saving thousands of dollars to the farmers of the state. Incidentally, the circulation of the *Western Rural* was increased, and the prestige and reputation of the trio of Iowa Agricultural experts somewhat impaired. This was the first round.

At this time the practice of furnishing newspapermen with the free railroad passes was well-nigh universal. Even the little local paper with a circulation of 500 copies weekly had an "annual" on the line on which it was located. Of course, these were given in return for advertising of time tables, or one thing and another. Big papers, including those published in the interests of agriculture, had all the passes they could use. Any newspaper writer who refrained from criticising railroad management, and especially the activity of the railroads in politics, had little difficulty in securing free transportation.

Agricultural fair managers and politicians got free passes. All state officials, and especially the members of the Legislature, were supplied liberally with these convenient pasteboards.

Milton George resolved to strike at this evil, as he regarded it, and to hit it hard. To begin with he refused all free passes in connection with his paper and announced that any railroad advertising in the *Western Rural* must pay cash. Editorial after editorial denouncing the free pass system followed.

Mr. George further stated that he was going to continue the crusade until free passes were prohibited by law. The responses to his protests were at first few and feeble. Everybody of any prominence was among the favored class. But Mr. George had faith in the common people and believed they would sustain him. He fully realized that if this movement was to succeed it must have an organization behind it. The Grange movement had subsided, although there were still a few active Granges in existence. Mr. George felt that the time was ripe for a new organization. We accordingly called a meeting at his office in Chicago,

Library of Congress

in 1880, and started the Farmers' Alliance, with "No free 27 railroad passes to public officials" as one of its principal objects.

Owing to my school duties, and my poverty, I was unable to attend this meeting, so the attendance was practically limited to the patrons of the *Western Rural*. Provisions were made for organizing local alliances everywhere. The following declaration of principles were adopted:

1st. We are the friends of the producer under all circumstances and will advocate his cause and defend his interests against all combinations that may oppose.

2nd. We demand that the producer shall be put upon an equal footing under the law with any man or combination of men.

3rd. We are opposed to all class legislation, and we are in favor of the repeal of all laws which give one man or a combination of men the advantage over any man or class of men.

4th. We demand such legal enactments as will guarantee equity between the farmers and the railroads, to the end that a railroad man shall not accumulate a princely fortune from the net profits of this road, while the farmer has to economize to make merely expenses.

5th. We fully recognize the utility of railroads, and are willing that railroad capital shall earn a reasonable per cent of profit, but are not willing that it shall tyrannize over and oppress our agricultural industries.

6th. We believe in building railroads where they are needed, and in encouraging their construction, provided when they are constructed they shall not be our masters and we their helpless slaves, and we know that this can be prevented by adopting the *Western Rural* plan of allowing a road to earn a reasonable per cent of profit upon its actual 28 worth, revaluation being made from time to time eliminating all watered stock.

Library of Congress

7th. We are opposed to the present laws of the United States which enable sharpers to inflict such injustice upon farmers of the country, and demand such laws as will compel a patentee to seek indemnity only from the manufacturer and seller of patented articles.

8th. We are opposed to that portion of the press which for a partisan purposes seeks to inveigle the farmer to support a partisan ticket, under the pretense that it is a "farmers' press," for the reason that the press is the molder of public opinion and should be held to a strict accountability.

9th. We are opposed to every advertising swindler in the United States and demand more stringent laws for the punishment of swindlers.

10th. We are opposed to every newspaper that seeks the patronage of the farmer and does not advocate his interests.

11th. We are the friends of every paper that is the unflinching friend of the American producer, and will do all we can to encourage it.

12th. We demand of our legislator such laws as will prevent the adulteration of food products, through which such great injustice is done to honest producers as well as consumers, while only the greed of capital is served.

13th. We are opposed to the free pass system and demand such laws as will make it a criminal offense for an official to accept a free pass or other favor from a railroad corporation.

14th. We demand a better system a better system of taxation to the end that the farmer shall not pay the greater proportion of the taxes.

15th. We demand that unearned land grants shall be forfeited.

Library of Congress

16th. We demand the payment of the public debt, that the drain of interest may be stopped, as rapidly as it can be paid, and are opposed to any system of finance that is based upon the perpetuation of the national debt.

17th. We demand such legislation in regard to the liquor traffic as will prevent that business from increasing our taxes and endangering the morals of our children and destroying the usefulness of our citizen.

18th. We believe in so amending the public school system that the education of our children shall be practical help to them in after life. The theoretical plan that now obtains infects many with the idea that physical labor is not genteel. This sentiment tends to create a helpless class whose inevitable drift is toward the almshouse and prison. Our country needs an educational system based on moral, manual and intellectual training that inculcates the essential dignity and necessity of honest labor.

19th. We thus declare for the benefit of both the producer and the consumer.

But no adequate system of financing the movement was devised. Mr. George feared that the people would think he was to be the financial gainer—that he intended to line his own pockets.

We hoped the farmers would rise up spontaneously as it were and unite in local alliances. Well, a few did here and there, notably in Wisconsin and later in Nebraska. Finally Mr. George suggested to me that I might take the lead in Iowa. We thought that the prestige we had gained in our fight on the barbed wire trust might be utilized to good advantage.

I accordingly called a meeting in the *Western Rural* tent on the State Fair Grounds, at Des Moines, during the fair in September, 1882, and here the Iowa State Farmers' Alliance was launched. A constitution was adopted, officers were chosen and the propaganda started.

Library of Congress

When the time came for calling the meeting to order there was barely a half dozen present, though others had been there and gone. I frankly confess that I took upon myself the job of organizing the Alliance. The summer previous I had met Jesse Kennedy, a prominent farmer of Ida County, at his home near Ida Grove. He was among those present and I asked him if he would not accept the office of president. He demurred at first, but I put the vote to the crowd and declared him elected. I then selected W. N. Oaks, of Warren County, for vice president.

Looking around the room I saw August Post, of Moulton, Apporrose County, and I suggested him for secretary and purchasing agent, which he reluctantly accepted. I do not remember whom I named for treasurer, but it is not material. I then thought my work was done, and was congratulating myself on the report I could transmit to Milton George, when some one mentioned that an organizer or lecturer was necessary. They all agreed and united upon me for this job. I protested that I was endeavoring to work my way through college, and as no salary was attached, and only a nominal commission, that I could not possibly take the position. But they insisted that as I had drafted them, they would proceed to draft me, and I had to yield. I mentioned above that the organizer as lecturer got 10 cents out of each member's 25-cents dues. But this was 31 only from the first, or charter members, and not from those who afterward joined.

The proceedings were duly published in the *Western Rural* and I went back to my school work at Drake University and put in my spare time trying to prepare myself for what I now regarded as my life's work. But the calls were few and far between. Sometime in March, 1873, near 1853 Lewis, in Cass County, I organized a local Alliance, and here I made probably the first public address in the state condemning the free pass system. It was with supreme satisfaction that only a few years later I sat in the reporter's gallery at the state capitol and witnessed the passage of a law making the giving and receiving a free railroad passage by a public official a criminal offense. One paper, the *Journal of Commerce*, at Des Moines, published our platform as follows:

The Farmer's Alliance

This organization is gaining a rapid foothold in the West, especially in Iowa, and seems destined to wield a powerful influence in the future in favor of the farmer's interests. It was the Alliance that first made the fight against bogus butter, and Alliance money that paid for the scientific analysis that proved beyond doubt the villainous character of the compound. It is the Alliance that created the sentiment in favor of the national regulation of railroads which has become so powerful that Congress dare not disregard it. Every farmer in the land should belong to this organization. Below we give the objects of the organization in a concise form.

The objects of the State Alliance are and shall be:

1st. To unite the farmers of the state in a bond of union for the protection and promotion of their own interests, both socially and in a financial sense.

2nd. To secure the enactment of laws to regulate and control the railroads of the state, to the end that extortion, unjust discrimination and favoritism in matters of transportation may be prohibited.

32

3rd. To secure the enactment of laws prohibiting the issuing of free passes to public officials and others.

4th. To secure the assessment of all kinds of taxable property, corporate and individual, on an equal basis, and the reduction of taxation to the lowest limit consistent with a proper administration of public affairs.

5th. To secure the highest possible prices for the produce of the farm.

Library of Congress

6th. To protect the dairy industry from the competition of olemargarine and other spurious compounds by securing the enactment of stringent laws for regulating or prohibiting the sale of the same.

7th. To aid and assist in such manner as the Alliance may determine the Farmers' Protective Association in the barbed wire contests.

8th. To secure a better representation of the agricultural interests in the National Congress and State Legislature.

9th. To secure stringent laws for the punishment of frauds and swindlers of all kinds, and especially of those who prey upon the producer.

10th. To aid and assist the members of the Alliance in all contests with the railroads, insurance companies and other corporations, and in suits for the infringement of patents or claims for royalty on patented articles.

11th. To aid and assist the National Alliance in pushing forward the special work of the organization.

The Alliance is non-partisan in its methods and seeks to work upon public sentiment through the regular party channels. Any seven practical and operative farmers who endorse the above principles can secure a charter by calling a meeting, electing temporary officers, selecting a name and sending a fee of 25 cents for each member to August Post, Moulton, Iowa, who is secretary of the State Alliance. The other officers are: President, Hon. Jesse Kennedy, Ida Grove; vice president, W. N. Oaks, Indianola; either of whom will answer any questions in regard to the organization. J. W. Witham, a student of Drake University, is state lecturer and organizer.

We met at the same place in 1883, and I think in 1884, and re-elected ourselves to office. Our organization opposed 33 railroad domination of politics and supported all co-operative

Library of Congress

movements, especially farmers' mutual insurance companies and co-operative grain elevators.

Secretary Post made a decided hit in ordering binding twine for the members at wholesale prices which he secured. About this time we discovered that the railroads were in politics in Iowa for every dollar they were worth. Railroad attorneys dominated the Legislature and rode roughshod over the rights and interests of the people. The Legislature refused to compel railway companies to fence their lands, or make adequate provisions for the payment of stock killed by trains, or for damages caused by fires set by the engines. All of these things were duly shown up in the *Western Rural*. Its readers became fully convinced that the Alliance was on the right track. In the fall of 1882 I aided in the election of a farmer to Congress from the Fourth Congressional District of the State. To make a fight for individuals was not Mr. George's policy. He preferred to merely advocate principles and build up public sentiment, but in this case he made an exception. The circulation of the *Rural* among the farmers in this district, covering the northeast corner of the state, was very large. The republicans had nominated one, Thomas Updegraph, a well-known railroad lawyer for Congress.

Opposed to him was a farmer named L. H. Weller, running on an independent, anti-monopoly platform. I wrote a brief article outlining the situation, and put the question squarely to the farmers, whether or not they preferred to be represented in Congress by a man confessedly in the employ of the railroads, or one whose business was tilling the soil like themselves. This article was published in the *Rural* under my signature of "Julius," and it so pleased Mr. Weller that I guess he had a copy place in the hands of every farmer in the district.

When the smoke of the political battle had cleared away, to the surprise of everybody, Mr. Weller was victor by some 2,000 majority and he claimed that this article of mine had "turned the trick." The election of Mr. Weller to Congress on this issue produced a decided

sensation. Was it possible, it was asked, that farmers can be induced to vote on class lines?

Ponderous editorials by the score were written and printed for the purpose of showing that the interests of railroads and the farming class were identical. The farmers, it was argued, must have adequate transportation to the markets for his products, and any legislation that hampered the railroads must necessarily react upon the farmer to his serious injury.

35

CHAPTER VI FIGHT IN THE IOWA LEGISLATURE

In 1875 Wm. Larrabee was elected governor. A man at the time especially friendly with the railroads, but owing largely to the agitation of the *Rural* and the Alliance, a good many legislators were chosen who did not wear the corporation collar—especially in the lower house. I arranged with some country papers to report the doings of the Legislature. At this session, January, 1886, the farmers and fair-minded members of the House waited upon a man named Albert Head, a large landowner of Green County, living at Jefferson, for speaker, and to the surprise of the railway lobby he won out in the caucus. This was partly due to the influence and the work of one man, James G. Berryhill of Des Moines, a member who had a fallout with the “Regency” as the *Register* or Clarkson gang was called. Berryhill was not only wealthy, able and discreet, but he was a splendid organizer and a man of both courage and convictions. He was a strong “dry,” and the booze interest and the corporations united in opposing him, but the State Senate was completely dominated by the railroads and other allied interests.

One member of that body, a lumber dealer of Williamsburg, Iowa County, returned his railroad pass. In all of my papers I referred to this senator as “Honest John Hughes,” and stated that he always voted right *because he didn't have a railroad pass*.

I supported Berryhill and Head to the best of my ability 36 in all the papers I could reach, and I fear I was alone in this work. Other reporters told me that it wouldn't pay, and that

Library of Congress

I would lose out, but still I persevered. My efforts in due time attracted the attention of the Clarksons. After the Legislature adjourned, I took up my law studies again in the law office of Cole, McVay and Clark, but roomed out at Drake University. As a matter of exercise, I frequently walked down town, about a mile and a half going by way of Pleasant Street. One of the Clarkson boys, "Dick," as he was called, lived on this street. He was the business manager of the *Daily and Weekly Register*. By accident or design he came out from his home a number of times as I was passing, and the *Register* office being in the same direction I was going, he walked along with me. Of course, I knew him by sight. While not very sociable, he was a kindly man at heart. He got to talking with me and learned that I was a young law student and was paying my way and laboring under difficulties of a financial nature. He spoke contemptuously of the legal profession, and suggested that I should enter the newspaper field, and ended up by offering me a job on the *Daily Register* as traveling agent and correspondent. I do not know that he was aware of my being nominally the organizer and lecturer of the Farmers' Alliance. He was possibly have regarded that organization as defunct.

He never mentioned the matter to me, as he said that there was a good opening for one of my talents and energy in going from town to town writing up the place and taking subscriptions and advertising, and he would either pay me a salary or commission.

There was a rival paper in Des Moines called the *Daily News*, of stern anti-monopoly tendencies, a supporter of 37 the Berryhill policies. I had long been their reporter from Drake University and vicinity, doing the work gratis, under the signature "ADrake," and I was personally very friendly with Mr. Hamilton, its chief manager, but there was no opening for me on this paper.

Since I did not positively refuse, Mr. Clarkson took it for granted that I would accept this flattering offer. Indeed I think I did go out on one or two short trips in the interest of the *Register* during the summer.

Library of Congress

At any rate he presented me an annual pass on the Illinois Central Railroad, which crosses the state from Dubuque to Sioux City, passing through many important towns like Webster City and Fort Dodge. A struggle now commenced in my bosom that was both sincere and lasting. I had given on the average one-half of my time for the past fourteen years to the advocacy and support of measures essential to the public welfare, but without any visible results of a substantial nature. Should I continue as a missionary on this line and throw my life away as it were, or should I accept remunerative employment that would enable me in a short time to establish a home, something I very much desired. I looked back over my past life, called to mind the hundreds of articles I had written and the talks I had made all on one side of what I knew must become in due time an absorbing issue in politics. I could not change this record, but would I not be justified in abandoning the cause? After a long mental struggle I decided that, having put my hand to the plow, I could not turn back, that I had a call to continue in this line of work and by God's help, come what may, I would persevere to the end. I accordingly returned my pass to Mr. Clarkson, and told him I could not accept this offer, after which I felt immensely relieved. I had successfully resisted a very great temptation. I decided at this time that I never would be a candidate for a public office nor accept any fixed salary for my labors in behalf of the farmer, and that I would endeavor to prepare myself so far as my ability would permit it, by reading and hard study. I defended the farmers' cause at all times and against all gainsayers or adverse interests. To these resolutions I have religiously adhered through all the nearly forty years that have since rolled by. I don't really know what Mr. Clarkson knew of my past record. His brother, James S., or "Ret," as he was familiarly known, was the politician, "Dick" was purely a business man. He may only have known of me as a struggling college student, who succeeded in working his own way through school, and felt that I should be encouraged.

At any rate he never hinted at my changing my views on public questions, or going back on my old time friends, but I knew very well that the nature of my work with the Clarksons

Library of Congress

would involve boosting of railways and kindred interests, and “puffing” professional politicians allied with corporations. In short, just the opposite of what I had been doing.

It was all the harder to turn down the Clarkson proposition because a sweet little girl, who expected to share my lot in life, was patiently waiting for me to get a start financially so I could provide her a home. But I thank God to this day that power was given me to resist the temptation.

After this things began coming our way rapidly.

I will briefly mention here a few of the causes that operated to make the Alliance a “power in the land” for the time being. For many years the state had had a 39 board of railroad commissioners, appointed by the governors, who were supposed to regulate railroads. The state had a public institution at Glenwood, in Mills County, and also one at Council Bluffs. Both had many inmates and each consumed a large quantity of coal. In looking over the bills for the shipment of fuel, which he was required to O.K. before they could be paid, Governor Larrabee discovered that the rate to Glenwood from the same mine was higher than to Council Bluffs, which was out forty miles farther, the cars to the Bluffs passing right through Glenwood. That is, the C. B. & Q. Railway Company *was charging more for the short haul than for the long haul*. In the innocence of his soul the governor supposed this was a mere clerical error and accordingly called the attention of the company to the matter. He may have expected to get some very cheap political capital out of the circumstances, as showing how carefully he was guarding the public treasury, not doubting that the “Q” would thank him for calling its attention to the mistake and make the necessary correction. The governor gave the facts to the press before the railway people had time to reply. To the great amazement of the governor the “Q” declared there was no error and defended the rate. A whole book might be written on the controversy that this argument between the railway and the governor caused, much of which was published, but it ended in causing the state to pay a higher rate to Council Bluffs, thereby the state

Library of Congress

losing money by the governor's interference and the intimation from some smart clerk in the railway headquarters that Larrabee would be a "one term" governor.

That was the end of the controversy, but really the beginning of the issue that was raised: shall a railroad be permitted to charge more for a short haul than for a long one?

There was an agricultural paper published at Des Moines, known as the *Western Farm Journal*, by B. F. Gue and son. In 1885 or 1886 Henry Wallace, before mentioned, and James Pierce bought this paper and its name was changed to the *Iowa Homestead*. Mr. Wallace became editor and Mr. Pierce its business manager. Mr. Pierce was an honest and aggressive anti-monopolist. We believed that the time had come for action. Not being able to agree they dissolved partnership. Mr. Pierce retained the *Homestead* and boosted the Alliance principles constantly and courageously, succeeding in time in making the *Homestead* the greatest and most influential agricultural paper in all the land, a position it still retains under the management of his son, Dante M. Pierce. In addition to this James Pierce became president of the Iowa Anti-Monopoly League, a volunteer organization, of which I was the secretary and manager.

The platform of this league was short, but comprehensive and far-reaching. It read as follows:

1. Abolish free railroad passes.
2. Elect railroad commissioners by the people.
3. Confer upon these officials the power to fix rates for the transportation of freight and prohibit unjust discrimination.
4. Assessing all kinds of property, both corporate and individual, on an equal basis.
5. Secure and maintain the economical administration of state and local government and reduce taxation to the lowest possible limit.

6. Enact stringent laws to punish frauds and swindles of all kinds.

41

7. Secure to every man the fruits of his own labor.

We never received any great amount of money, probably less than \$500 in all, but its influence on politics was tremendous. I gave my services free, even bearing part of the expense. We backed Governor Larrabee for a second term and made a systematic and successful effort to capture the Republican State Convention in 1887, in order to give him the nomination. Heretofore it had been the custom for each of the five big railways to gather up the delegates on their respective lines and carry them down to Des Moines in Pullmans free of charge. In return they were expected to vote for the candidates the railroads favored and adopt a platform favorable to the same interests.

They rightly calculated that no man would be so ungrateful as to accept this courteous hospitality and then antagonize them. But in this convention the majority of delegates evidently paid their own way, for it was completely dominated by the friends of Governor Larrabee, and radical restrictive railroad legislation demanded. In accordance with this platform we carried the fight into nearly every legislative district. Governor Larrabee was triumphantly re-elected, and along with him probably the most intensely anti-monopoly Legislature that ever sat up to that time in any state of the Union. I had taken the precaution to advise the people to select a few lawyers who had never been railroad attorneys, and who could be trusted, especially for the Lower House, and this had been done, notably in Franklin County, where they selected a lawyer named Luke, and in Poweshick, where W. H. Redman was chosen.

This work was all done inside the republican party, whose machinery we had captured. The Legislature 42 selected Redman for speaker, and he made Mr. Luke, who was by the way a very able and careful lawyer, chairman of the committee on railroads.

Library of Congress

In my capacity as Alliance organizer, or as secretary of the Anti-Monopoly League, during 1886-7 I had visited nearly every county in the state and spoke in the most of them.

When the State Alliance met in September, 1887, Secretary Post showed that more than one thousand locals had been organized and the organization was on its feet financially, even with its small membership fee, and was able to pay an organizer. Mr. Henry Wallace had a thrifty and aspiring son-in-law by the name of Ashby who sought the job. Some of the delegates to this State Alliance on learning that I never owned a farm, had only been a farm hand, and was now a law student, could not understand why I took such a great interest in the movement. They thought I must have an axe to grind.

My friends, and those who knew me personally, stood by me however, and I might have had the job, but not without a contest. I told them the Alliance was now on its feet, that I still had a couple of years of school work before me, and that I desired to attend the forthcoming session of the Legislature. They accordingly elected Ashby state lecturer and organizer and I went back to my books for a brief period.

For the legislative session I arranged to report its proceedings to a large number of newspapers, more than fifty in all. This Legislature was true to its pledges, and gave the state the best laws to regulate and control railways of any state in the Union, with much other good legislation.

Among other things it made accepting free railroad 43 passes by public officials a crime. Among the influential newspapers in Iowa that published my reports in full and endorsed our movement editorially was the *Muscatine Journal*, then owned by Hon. John Mahin, one of the cleanest, most conscientious editors that it has ever been my good fortune to meet.

Of course I kept Mr. George and the *Western Rural* readers fully informed of our work in Iowa and of our methods. Among the other papers I succeeded in interesting in our movement was the *Omaha Bee*, then owned and published by Edward Rosewater, who

issued both a daily and weekly. Mr. Rosewater was very desirous of building up a big circulation among farmers of the *Weekly Bee*. To accomplish this result he championed the cause of the Alliance. The railroad interests centered at Omaha it seems had turned a cold shoulder on Rosewater, the particulars of which I never learned. So both the *Daily* and *Weekly Bee*, for the time being, became friends of the farmer and championed the anti-monopoly cause.

44

CHAPTER VII SOME INTERESTING HISTORY

Of course the corporation contingent in the republican party in Iowa which had heretofore run things was mighty sore. It had lost and so to speak must get even at any cost.

So, in 1889, it raised a false issue, and uniting with the democrats, defeated Hiram C. Wheeler, the biggest farmer in the state, and elected the democratic candidate, Horace Boies, governor, along with a majority of the State Senate and "broke even" in the Lower House, fifty on each side. But they dared not make a serious attempt to repeal the railway legislation that had been enacted, but all of the reactionary papers could claim with a sure probability that this result was brought about by the republican party's radicalism and by its too restrictive railroad legislation.

Strange as it may seem, Mr. N. B. Ashby, although at that time lecturer for the Alliance, took an active part in this movement, for which he was bounced and separated from his job by the Alliance, but subsequently rewarded by President Cleveland with a foreign office, but he had done the Alliance great damage.

Meanwhile I had finished my school course. My strenuous exertions had so broken down my health that I was compelled to take up outdoor work. I retired to a small fruit farm in the suburbs of Des Moines, organized and joined a local Alliance, and became a tiller of the soil.

Library of Congress

The State Alliance elected a new lecturer, whose name 45 I have forgotten, and kept on with its strength however diminishing.

The Alliance in Nebraska

It will be remembered that the Farmers' Alliance was national in its scope, as it was designed to control Congress. Each state, however, was allowed to pursue its own methods. Encouraged by what was happening in Iowa, the Alliance grew like a green bay tree in our State of Nebraska. In that state the boys cut loose from both old parties and in 1890 elected the governor by a small plurality and a majority in both branches of the Legislature.

I felt in my duty to go ut to Lincoln and dare them if I could into securing legislation similar to that which had been enacted in Iowa. But they had not taken the precaution to select among their candidates for the Legislature able lawyers or men familiar with legal forms and technicalities. Some discrepancies in the votes on governor in Grand Island and in Omaha were found which inured to the advantage of Boyd, the democratic candidate, and gave him a plurality of a hundred or so on the face of the returns, but the Legislature in that state counts the votes for governor and declared the result, so if the independents had only had competent leaders they could have won the day. Everybody knew that the returns had been "doctored" in Boyd's interest in the precincts in question, but no independent appeared to know how to go at it legally to ascertain this fact.

I did not belong to that state and, as is often the case, they were just a little jealous of outsiders. It might have been a reflection on their intelligence to consult with me. I was sorely tempted to jump at any cost and give them 46 advice as to the proper procedure in order to seat their governor whom I had no doubt was fairly elected, though by a very small plurality, but refrained from doing so.

Library of Congress

Their candidate, John H. Powers, himself should have employed an able attorney and instituted a contest in the manner and according to the forms of law governing such cases. But he failed to do so and Boyd was sworn in as governor with the power to veto all legislation that could not command a two-thirds vote in both Houses, which the Alliance did not have. The Alliance boys, fresh from the farm, all with limited education and with no legislative experience whatsoever, were no match for the trained and experienced members representing the republican and democratic contingents. They could vote them over a roll call, but that was about all.

The choice for speaker of the House fell on Sam Elder I think he came from clay County. After he was nominated I ventured to suggest or ask if he was familiar with "Parliamentary Law." "What's that?" he answered. I explained to him that it was the method of procedure in all deliberative bodies in the transaction of business. He thanked me very much for calling his attention to the matter and insisted that I should give him instructions. He proved to be a very apt scholar and managed his part very well with an occasional prompting delivered by a nod of the head indicating yes or no.

I told him among other things that he was in supreme control of the House under its rules and that no one could claim the floor or talk without his consent. Also that he could take the floor away from a member at any time for the purpose of making a statement relating to any pending matter.

47

I also cautioned him about getting rattled. I advised him to be slow and deliberate in rendering his opinions and to take all the time he needed. The republicans and democrats held out the idea to the people that the Alliance had sent a lot of ignorant and incompetent men up to Lincoln to make the laws, and in order to prove it, they decided to play horse with the speakers. They planned that one member was to offer an original resolution,

Library of Congress

another was to move an amendment, and then a third to propose an amendment to this amendment, and so on down the line until every member had got in his proposed change.

Now parliamentary law permitted an amendment to an amendment only and when the fourth man arose I shook my head. The speaker saw the motion, but he did not know what was wrong and consequently he could not handle the situation. Not being able to give a reason I shook my head each time as each member arose and gravely proposed some foolish amendment. At length, when about the seventeenth man claimed the floor, the speaker became desperate and decided to take the animal by the horns in his own peculiar way. "Sit down there," he said, "I man it," he added, and the man dropped back into his seat. Then in a very slow and deliberate manner he continued: "You don't know where you're at," pointing with his gravel to the man who had last claimed the floor. "This House don't know where it is at. I don't know where I'm at. [Great laughter.] So we'll just unhitch and go to dinner," and with these words the House was adjourned.

The republicans and democrats who had been members of farmers' legislatures finally took hold and helped prepare the necessary appropriation bills and such measures that were necessary to pass. But the session ended with 48 no real anti-monopoly laws enacted or any legislation inimical to the railroads. I want to say, however, that the boys from the Nebraska farms who made up a majority of this Legislature were mighty bright scholars and very quick to learn. Had they all been re-elected along with a sympathetic governor the session that met in January, 1893, they would have given the railroads and other corporations no end of trouble.

To prevent such a happening both the republicans and democrats, in their platforms and in speeches during the campaign, promised the reformers about everything they desired, and then proceeded to forget these promises as soon as they were elected.

But the educational work of the Alliance has exerted an influence in the politics of Nebraska that is felt to the present day. Hon. Geo. W. Norris, one of the few western

Library of Congress

United States Senators that big business or the corporations do not either own or control, has creditably represented that state in the Senate these many years.

My Address to the Iowa Alliances

I prepared and delivered the following address to the local Alliances in Iowa during the ten years from 1882 to 1892.

THE OBJECTS AND AIMS OF THE FARMERS' ALLIANCE—NECESSITY OF ACTION. By J. W. Witham

Ladies and Gentleman:

I appear before you tonight not in the interest of any political organization or aspiring politicians. I do not know but some of the questions I may discuss may encroach upon the domain of politics, but if they do I shall certainly treat them from nonpartisan standpoint.

49

It is, indeed, a true saying that the presentation of new truths without offending old errors is a most difficult undertaking and I dislike very much to mention even this one fact, but I suppose you are all somewhat anxious to know—as my lectures are delivered free—who pays me for my time and foots my expenses. So I must tell you, I suppose, that I am recognized in Iowa as the representative of *The Western Rural*, an agricultural paper printed in Chicago. That is all I am going to say about myself. This paper will now demands my attention.

Six years ago, when hogs in Iowa were selling for about \$2 per hundred, and everything else in proportion, when the farmers of our state were thoroughly discouraged, when bankruptcy and ruin were staring them in the face, a leading western railroad increased its freight tariff 10 per cent.

Library of Congress

Knowing the impoverished condition of the farming classes the editor of the *Rural* went down to the office and sought the general freight agent and asked him on behalf of the western farmer what he meant. Said the editor: "Don't you make a fair interest on your investment now?" "Suppose we do," was the answer, "what of that?" "Why," said the editor, "the farmers are not making a living even, let alone any interest." "Then that is their own fault, let them work harder," says the railroad man. "But," rejoined the editor, "it doesn't" make any difference how hard they work if you get all the profits." The railroad man had got tired of the discussion by this time and with the remark that "they would see to the profits, and the farmers could look out for themselves," he moved off, fumbling his gold watch chain. This at least was the substance of the interview.

The editor as he went away reflected that if they had a right to arbitrarily increase their rates 10 per cent, why not 20, 30, 50 or even 100 per cent, and if this were true was not all business of this western country practically at the mercy of the five men who controlled the leading lines of transportation, and that these men were responsible to nobody or nothing but their own pocketbooks. Then he remembered that the Supreme Court had decided that the State Legislature had the right to regulate railroad charges, and that the Constitution granted to Congress the power to regulate commerce between the states.

He thought that he saw here a solution of the question, and all he had to do was to bring this matter to the notice of these law-making bodies. However, he did not know but that they 50 would take him for a crank if he went down there alone, so he went home and began to agitate the question in his paper. He also sent out pamphlets by the hundred thousand, and petitions embodying his views to be signed and returned. Two years ago this winter he had secured 425,000 names, and he thought with this backing he would get a respectable hearing. So he went down to Congress with his petitions.

The editor thought of course that he was going to accomplish something, and felt proud of his work, but when he got there he was grievously mistaken.

Library of Congress

A few congressman treated him respectfully, but the greater number of them laughed at him and said: "See here old man, you are a little off. You have been wasting your time. The idea of your getting any Legislature hostile to railroads!" They thought it was inexpressibly funny and they kicked the petition under the table, and that was the last we heard of it. I may add that a similar petition was presented to the Iowa Legislature and met with a like fate. The editor of the *Rural* at this juncture felt a little like the old man when he caught the boy up in his apple tree stealing apples. You have all heard the story how, after pelting away with grass for a while to the infinite amusement of the boy, he finally tired what virtue there was in stones, which speedily brought the humbled youth to the ground to beg the old man's pardon.

Well, the editor had pelted away at our congressmen with petitions and they only laughed at him, so he went home to try what virtue there was in votes.

When the railroad managers heard this they said: "Your are a fool. You can't do anything. You had better take your passes and shut up." And they had the audacity to tell him that he could not get a corporal's guard of farmers together in opposition to railroad extortion. Finding they could not bribe him they withdrew all advertising patronage and today the *Rural* is the only agricultural paper in the land that has no business connection with railroads; in other words, does not accept free passes for the editor and its agents. Well, the editor came home convinced that he must get at them in some other manner if he meant to accomplish anything, so he formulated his principles, kept on issuing anti-monopoly documents, and finally called a convention of all the anti-monopolists in the country to meet in 51 Chicago on the 14th of October, 1880, to devise ways and means to carry on the work.

In response to this call a goodly number of farmers, including delegates from several farmers' clubs in New York, met in the office of the *Rural* and formed the National Alliance.

Library of Congress

The *Rural* bore the expenses of the National Alliance for the first year, and sent out the charters free of cost.

During the first year 1,000 subordinate Alliance were found about 250 in Kansas, 300 in Nebraska and over a hundred in Iowa. The remainder were scattered over all the Northern State, quite a number of them being down in New York and New England. To show you what the Alliances propose to do I will read you the platform of principles adopted at the last meeting of the National Alliance by a unanimous vote.

Resolve:—

1. That all property, real and personal, individual or corporate, should be equally taxed.
2. That the salaries of public officers should only be a fair compensation for services rendered, and all civil officers, so far as practicable, should be elective.
3. That we favor a just income tax.
4. That we emphatically condemn the practice of receiving free railroad passes by judges, members of Congress, legislators and public officials.
5. That it is the duty of the general government to exercise its constitutional right to regulate commerce between the states by passing such laws and adopting such regulations as will secure to the whole people just and impartial rates of transportation of freight and passengers.
6. That the combination and consolidation of railroad capital and its influence in the United States in maintaining an oppressive and tyrannical transportation system are accomplished facts demanding instant, vigorous and unceasing action on the part of the producers of the country to remedy the same, and we earnestly urge all farmers to organize through the Farmers' Alliance, or other organization, for systematic and persistent

Library of Congress

political action, and to subordinate other political questions to the emancipation of the people from this terrible oppression.

7. That we demand such changes in our patent laws as will give patentees a remedy for the infringement of their patents against the sellers of same only, and not from their users, who 52 are innocent purchasers of rights which they are made to believe are valid.

8. That all parties should be allowed to make patented articles on the payment of a royalty of a certain percentage, said percentage to be the same on all patents.

9. That the adulteration of food is more dishonest than counterfeiting money, and should be punished as severely.

10. We recommend that all elective officers should be nominated by a direct vote of all the members of the organization.

11. The convention also resolved that it was in hearty sympathy with the efforts of the Farmers' Protective Association in its effort to break down the barbed wire combination.

From these resolutions it is very evident that there is a work before us second in importance to no political question that has agitated this country.

The National Alliance does not propose to lop off an ear here or an arm there, but is going to strike home to the very heart of this mighty giant of monopoly which has been reared and fostered in our midst by twenty years of the most vicious class legislation that has ever disgraced civilization. While the war was going on monopolies got a strong foothold, because nobody had any time to pay attention to them, and the questions growing out of the war have been skilfully used ever since to blind people to the real and living issues of the day.

Library of Congress

Is it politic, is it sensible to vote for a railroad attorney for Congress today simply because he believes that Jeff Davis is a traitor and Andrew Johnson ought to have been hung?

Well, a good many congressmen are elected on just as obsolete issues as these. Not long since a member of Congress rose upon the floor and declared that in the last sixteen years, during which time every possible protection has been thrown around capital, Congress has never devoted one single hour to the consideration for questions looking to the betterment of the condition of the laboring classes.

What else can you expect of a Congress composed of about one hundred lawyers and railroad attorneys and two hundred bankers?

The productive industries of this country have no representation on the floor of Congress.

By a late census it is proved that the toiling millions, the labor of whose hands has produced all the wealth of this country, 53 only possess about one-third of it, while the non-producers and capitalists hold the other two-thirds. Thirty years ago the positions were exactly reversed. The capitalists had only one-third and the producer the balance.

So it seems that in the last thirty years, assuming that nine-tenths of the people something; as often as \$3.00 has been produced, the nine laboring men have together only \$1.00, while the tenth man who stood with his hands in his pockets and looked on has got \$2.00.

How long, my friends, must this continue before we will become a nation of millionaires and paupers? The history of the railroad management of this country is one long succession of broken contracts, violated pledges, unjust discrimination, wholesale extortion and downright bribery and corruption.

Taking advantage of the people's necessities the railroad managers have for years been standing at the doors of commerce exacting such toll as their own cupidity, should prompt, responsible to nobody but themselves. Consequently it is no wonder that our leading

Library of Congress

railroad magnates are worth their hundred millions and the combined power of railroad capital overshadows every other interest in the country. Let us take the history of a few roads, for instance, and see how this power has been obtained. In 1864 the charter was granted to the Union Pacific Railroad. \$64,000,000 in government bonds was granted it to use for a certain time without Interest, and every alternate section on both sides of the road for twenty miles was donated free of cost, making about 13,000 acres of land to the mile. Considering that all the town lots on this line were originally owned by the R. R. Co., this land netted at least \$5.00 per acre or \$65,000 per mile from this source alone. Why, the Government actually built the road and save it to these rich men, coupled with the right to charge the people who were compelled to use it whatever they pleased, and now these managers turn around and refuse to pay interest on the bonds for there was a provision in the contract requiring the railroad company to pay interest on the bonds after a certain time, and now the managers won't do that. We have got to sue them to collect the interest.

I will now give you a little of Jay Gould's history:

At the close of Black Friday, less than twenty years ago, Jay Gould was almost a bankrupt. He then got hold of the Union Pacific, afterward the Kansas Pacific, the St. Louis, Kansas City 54 & Northern, and the Central of New Jersey. He then purchased the Northern Pacific for \$5,000,000 and issued \$25,000,000 watered stock, upon which he made a clean profit of \$11,000,000. He next paid \$3,000,000 for the control of the St. Louis, Iron Mountain and Southern; soon after that, the Southern Pacific, and his wealth is as follows with the back counties to hear from: Union Pacific stock, \$10,000,000; Wabash, \$4,000,000; Northern Pacific, \$5,000,000; Texas Pacific, \$10,000,000; Kansas Pacific, \$2,000,000; and \$22,500 of telegraph stock and about \$10,000,000 of other stock, making in all, about \$70,000,000 accumulated by a man who has never actually created a dollar's worth of wealth in all his time. After Gould bought the Northern Pacific for \$4,000,000, he watered the stock \$30,000,000 and the C. R. I. & P. stock, which was worth less than \$30,000,000 in 1878, increased to over \$60,000,000 in 1881.

Library of Congress

Since these computations were made, Gould has secured complete control of the telegraph lines of the country and has bought up three of the leading newspapers that belong to the Associated Press. In one hand he holds the *New York Tribune*, and dictates to the republicans what they shall do; in the other he holds the *New York World*, and dictates to the democrats. I expect if the greenbackers ever get sufficiently numerous to menace his designs, he will buy up their leading papers and dictate to them.

According to his own testimony, Gould does not scruple to take an active part in politics. In 1879 he was before an investigating committee of the New York Legislature and testified that he could no more tell how often he had helped nominate and elect friendly men than he could the number of cars that go over his road each day, showing that he was a liberal subscriber to the campaign fund. But what did he mean by that word "friendly"? Did he mean friendly to the republicans or democrats? Neither, but friendly to the Erie R. R. and the interests of Jay Gould, for a little further on, when asked his politics, he scratched his head and said, "In a republican district I am a republican, in a democratic district I am a democrat, and in a doubtful district I don't know what I am, but in all districts and under all circumstances I have always been an Erie Railroad man."

In regard to unjust discrimination I will cite the case of the Standard Oil Co. to show how it works.

This company, which was formed in Cleveland, Ohio, in 1861 or 1862 for the purpose of refining oil, has a nominal capital of 55 \$3,000,000 upon which it makes million of profit annually. Well, some years ago it went to the railroad managers and said, "See here, help us get monopoly of this business and we will divide the profits." And according to their own books they received in the course of eighteen months, \$10,000,000 in rebates, and crushed out 273 other refineries and secured a monopoly of one of the leading necessities of civilization. This oil company brought before the committee previously mentioned, refused to testify on the ground that their testimony might incriminate them. The alliance

Library of Congress

believes that all business men shall have a fair show in this country and that Congress should interpose to prevent such abuse of Corporate power.

The extent of railroad ramifications in the politics of this country is really astounding. Not long since, Stanley Matthews, one of Gould's attorneys, was elected to the Supreme Court. You will remember that when the tidal wave of anti-monopoly reform swept over this country in 1874, the railroad magnates denied the right of the people to regulate their charges, and contested the matter before the Supreme Court and were beaten. They now undertake to remodel that Court in their own interest in order that this last bulwark of liberty may be swept away.

The other day I read in the papers that way down in the Indian Territory, the Choctaws are about to elect a chief, and even here the railroads have a candidate! This railroad influence extends all the way down, from the selection of a Supreme Judge, to the election of a petty Indian Chief!

Did ever you stop and think, gentlemen, that there is a vast difference between the earnings of a railroad? If you hear of a farmer selling a big crop of grain and putting the money in the bank, you will say, "Well, that's all right, glad to hear he is doing well." Why may you say that? Because he created that wealth, he dug it out of the soil. But when you hear of railroad stock being at 50 per cent above par and semi-annual dividends being declared, if you stop and think, you will say, "The railroads are making it off of me, and every other farmer and just person in proportion; as their gains increase, mine decrease."

Now this is our position on this question. Railroads are entitled to make a fair interest upon their investment, but not upon their watered stock, and farmers are entitled to get their produce to market at such rates as will only allow railroads to make that profit.

56

To make this matter plain, I will give you an illustration: Supposing that today, corn in Chicago is worth 50 cents per bushel and other grains in proportion, and it had been

Library of Congress

demonstrated that a charge of 10 cents per bushel would be sufficient to allow a railroad a fair interest on their investment, then the alliance holds that the balance of that money or the 40 cents belongs to the farmer. But the railroads, on the theory of charging what the traffic will bear, insist that if corn is worth 50 cents per bushel, their charge should be 30 cents per bushel, or in other words, all the profits of farming belong to them. On this tremendous issue which involves the weal or woe of this vast Western Empire, the welfare of future generations, and as we verily believe, the perpetuity of this Government the *Western Rural* and the Farmers' Alliance have locked horns with the five billion of railroad capital of this country.

In this contest, every man who raises a bushel of grain or feeds a single animal for the market, has an interest. We believed when we began this struggle that every producer in this country—every laborer upon the farm, when he once understood this question—would give us his active and earnest support. Shall we be disappointed in this matter? It is for you gentlemen to decide. A half dozen farmers and a dozen of these cannot carry forward this work to a successful termination. It will require the united assistance of the producing classes in this whole Northwest.

Now, a few more words in regard to land grants to railroads. The present Congress in the beginning of the session called upon the secretary of the interior for a report of the amount of lands granted to different corporations. Also, whether the corporations had fulfilled the conditions of the grants, and he made a statement that there had been granted to six railway companies almost 116,000,000 acres of land. That they had acquired legal title to about 18,000,000 acres and set up an equitable title to 14,000,000 more, leaving about 83,000,000 acres that they had no title to whatever.

Do you comprehend how large an area of land these grants include?

The amount legally earned by these six companies cover 29,000 square miles, and are greater than all Northeast, except Maine.

While the amount forfeited to the Government and for which the railroads have no shadow of a title, exceeds 130,000 square miles, and area greater than all New England, New York, New Jersey 57 and Maryland, or equal in extent to the three great states of New York, Pennsylvania and Ohio.

Yet the power of monopoly is so great that an effort to get a resolution through Congress, declaring that this land should revert to the Government, ignominiously failed. Thus, it seems that this vast territory and empire in itself, worth fully a billion of dollars must be *stolen* the people, and become a free gift to corporations.

58

CHAPTER VIII FARMERS' ORGANIZATIONS The Grange

The first farmers' organization in this country is known as the Grange. It was started in 1867 by some ten persons in the City of Washington, D. C. Wm. Saunders, a thoughtful Scotchman, head of the botanical gardens of the Department of Agriculture, was the real founder. O. H. Kelley, a friend of Mr Saunders, and a Minnesota man, had much to do with formulating its ritual and became its first organizer and was for a long time its most efficient secretary. The first Grange was instituted on the 4th of December, 1867, in Mr. Saunders' office in Washington by "less than ten persons."

Wm. Saunders was elected president, or as the office was designated, master; J. R. Thompson of Vermont, lecturer; Anson Bartlett, Ohio, overseer; Wm. Muir, editor of a paper published at St. Louis called *The Rural World*, steward; A. S. Moss, of New York, assistant steward; A. B. Grosh, of Pennsylvania, chaplain; Wm. M. Ireland, also of Pennsylvania, treasurer; Edward P. Faris, of Illinois, gate keeper, and as already noted, O. H. Kelley, of Minnesota, secretary. Provision had been made in the constitution for lady officers, but evidently no ladies were present, since none were elected. It would seem that every single person present got an office. The four offices to be filled by women were Ceres, Pomona and Flora, representing grains, fruits and flowers, and a lady assistant

Library of Congress

steward. 59 This was known as the National Grange. The first local or subordinate Grange was shortly afterward instituted, composed of some sixty farmers near the same city, which was used as a school of instruction.

Mr. Kelley accepted the position of national organizer also and his second local Grange was established near Harrisburg, Pennsylvania, and a third at Fredonia, New York. Mr. Kelley, however, gave up the work temporarily and retired to his farm in Sherburne County, Minnesota, where he remained two and one-half years, issuing dispensations for subordinate Granges whenever there should be a call, which for a time were few and far between, only eleven Granges being instituted in 1868, thirty-nine in 1869 and one less in the following year. The Grange at this stage of its life was very sickly and no doubt would have died but for the efforts of Mr. Kelley and of Mr. T. A. Thompson, another public-spirited citizen of this state, who was ably assisted by Col. D. A. Robertson and T. T. Smith of Ramsey County.

At this juncture unexpected assistance was received from the South. Co. D. Wyatt Aikin, of Cokesbury, South Carolina, became an enthusiastic convert to the Grange idea. He was a well-known and extensive planter and in a short time some four hundred subordinate Granges had been organized in the Palmetto state and the movement had spread like wildfire to Georgia and North Carolina. From 1871 the movement grew with great rapidity, especially in Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota. By 1874 there were over twelve thousand Granges, covering every state in the Union.

The general purpose of the Grange was to promote the interests of agriculture, religious and political subjects 60 being barred from discussion. But in the storm center, in the great Central States of Illinois Iowa, Wisconsin and Minnesota, the trend of both the discussion and action was largely along political lines, especially directed at discrimination and extortion in railroad charges.

Library of Congress

Under the impulse and inspiration of the Grange, Illinois adopted a brand new State Constitution, and elected a State Legislature that arbitrarily reduced passenger rates from 5 to 3 cents per mile, and provided for the regulation of public warehouses. Iowa reduced the passenger fare on its railroads, and growing out of this legislation were the two famous cases of Minnesota vs. Illinois, and The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad vs. The State of Iowa, under which the Supreme Court of the United States, with Justices Field and Strong dissenting, settled for all time the right of the people to fix railroad and warehouse charges, decisions scarcely second in importance to the famous Dred Scott case. For these decisions the Grange should have due credit.

The Grange is also responsible for the breaking down of that bitter partisan feeling growing out of the great Civil War, that politicians, for ulterior motives, so sedulously inculcated.

The great catalog house of Montgomery Ward & Co., of Chicago, so well and favorably known by millions of farmer patrons, and which was the first concern that sold direct to the consumer at wholesale prices, and is still in the business, is an outgrowth of the Grange movement.

The Farmers' Alliance

The next popular farmer's organization is known as the Farmer's Alliance. About the year 1876, Milton B. George, a successful farmer living near Farmington, Illinois, loaned a large sum of money to a man named Lewis, publisher in Chicago of a sprightly agricultural paper called *The Western Rural*. Lewis failed in business and Mr. George was compelled to take over the paper and in due time became its owner and editor. Railroad extortion and discrimination and the unfair management of the Union Stock Yards at Chicago engaged Mr. George's attention and were the subject of many editorials. These editorials were extremely popular with the farmers and gave the paper a wide circulation. The writer was then a farm boy in Iowa at the time, and having been much interested in the work of the Grange, took up with *The Western Rural*. The large clubs of subscribers sent in by the

Library of Congress

writer attracted Mr. George's attention, and although he was but a college youth, he was called into counsel with Mr. George in regard to starting a new farmer's organization. Mr. George owned a farm on the outskirts of Chicago, and in 1881 launched the Farmer's Alliance, made up of his nearby neighbors. A conspicuous plank in the platform was a declaration against "free railroad passes to public officials and others." Mr. George patriotically set the pace by refusing free transportation himself on account of his paper.

At that time a railroad pass was a mark of nobility in this country. All newspapers, big and little, all prominent public officials, including lawmakers and judges of our courts, as well as prominent politicians had annual passes, and even the preachers had half-fare permits. To stand in with the railroads in order to get free transportation seemed to be the main object in life with about one-half of the population.

62

All of this time the railway managers were solemnly asserting that these convenient pasteboards were furnished as a mere courtesy.

I had a suspicion that the wily railroad magnates were not so benevolent as they pretended, that they had other objects in view, and resolved to apply the test. Having discovered that a certain railway company was guilty of a violation of the law—it was only a technical matter—I reported the fact to the Board of Railway Commissioners, and then hired out to a newspaper to do certain work which required my traveling over the railroad. The manager of the paper wrote me that his application for a pass in my name was refused, and since he had a contract covering the matter, he "wondered why." When I traveled over Iowa railroads after that in newspaper service I generally rode on a pass issued in the name of another person or I paid my fare.

While the Alliance was like the Grange in many respects, it was no secret, and the discussion of questions of a semi-political nature were allowed. The Alliance grew apace among the readers of *The Western Rural*, especially in the Central West, but the other

Library of Congress

agricultural papers turned a cold shoulder to the movement. Some of them were openly hostile, the editors seeming to think that it was a shrewd plan on the part of Mr. George to boom the circulation of his publication. In 1882 the writer and others started the movement in Iowa, which stood at a standstill for some four years when it suddenly took a boom, and in 1888 it had grown to a membership of more than one hundred thousand and had become a dominating force in the politics of that state. In Kansas and in Nebraska for a time the Alliance swept everything before it in the political field, even sending its representatives to the United States Senate.

In Minnesota the Alliance was likewise a disturbing factor in politics, sending Kittel Halvorsen to Congress from the western part of the state and electing several members of the State Legislature, including the noted Ignatius Donnelly. As a result of the Alliance agitation the convicts at the state penitentiary at Stillwater were set to manufacturing binding twine, which was sold to the Minnesota farmers at a little more than cost. This business has been continued more than a quarter of a century, gradually increasing each year, and last season the output exceeded 22,000,000 pounds, with an approximate saving to the grain growers of more than \$750,000. The entire saving since the inception of the enterprise is fully \$8,000,000. A line of farm machinery is also manufactured, which should be increased.

The American Society of Equity

About the beginning of the century, one, J. A. Everett, a small seedsman of Indianapolis, Indiana, conceived the idea of starting a farmers' organization, which he named the American Society of Equity. The main purpose of this organization, as outlined by Mr. Everett, was to secure better prices for farm products by a system of feeding the market only so fast as consumption might demand. Mr. Everett published a cheap paper, which he called *Up-to-Date Farming*, largely to advertise his seed business.

Library of Congress

In order that he might get something for originating the idea Mr. Everett organized a corporation, which he dominated, composed largely of his own employees.

This local union, as it was called, elected Everett president. It also made a contract with him as an individual by which the present members and all who might subsequently join agreed and were bound to pay the sum of 35 cents per year as a subscription to *Up-to-Date Farming*. The paper thus became an organ of the society with its president as editor. The plan was very simple. A national convention of delegates from every local was provided for to meet each fall, at which time the crop conditions would be taken into consideration and a price recommended, as a guide for the producers. For instance, corn should bring so much, wheat so much, and this price list kept standing in the paper, which being sent to all members, would enable any farmer to ask the price named, since no one was expected to sell for less, although not required to do so.

The Society grew by leaps and bounds, especially in Kentucky, where the tobacco growers by getting together and naming a price forced the American Tobacco Company to pay fully twice as much as formerly for raw tobacco. The wheat growers in North Dakota, Kansas and Montana also held out for "dollar wheat," and no doubt raised the price.

The National Convention of the Society of Equity for 1907 was held in East. St. Louis, Illinois, and the writer was a delegate to that convention from Iowa. He was chairman of the committee on the press, and acting in that capacity, unearthed and brought to light the contract Everett had made with the Society in regard to the paper—a contract running for fifty years. The movement, which Everett claimed he was pushing at his own expense has already given him 250,000 subscribers, and was in a fair way to make him a millionaire.

He was asked to either surrender his contract or sell his paper to the Society, which had already added more than 65 \$100,000 to its value, but he declined to do either. As a result at its next annual meeting, which was held in Indianapolis, the organization went

Library of Congress

to pieces and Everett was repudiated and dethroned. The Equity Society has since been reorganized on a firm and enduring basis and its wielding a powerful influence for good.

Farmers' Clubs

The simplest form of organization is the farmers' club. The people, young and old, of a neighborhood get together at the home of one of their number, or at the schoolhouse, adopt some simple rules, elect a president and other officers, provide a small membership fee, and proceed to have a good time. Sociability at first is a leading feature. The farmers and their families get acquainted with each other. Then local matters are taken up for discussion and action taken. A light lunch is served from well-filled baskets, and everybody goes home at midnight or later having had what they call "a jolly time." A lecture on some interesting topic by some speaker from a distance is often a prominent feature of the program. The writer has visited and addressed many of these clubs in Minnesota and can testify as to their value to any neighborhood. The Extension Division of the State Agricultural College, under the management of Prof. A. D. Wilson, has taken a leading part in the formation of these clubs, now some twelve hundred in number, and reaching into every corner of the state. County clubs have also been organized, and a State Federation formed, which any local club may join by sending the name of the club with its location, and name and address of its officers, together with a small fee of \$2, to the treasurer, Sam Hammerbeck, Little Falls, Minnesota. I 66 strongly advise every club to unit with the Federation for in union there is strength.

Co-operative Associations

Co-operative associations of farmers along business lines are very numerous in Minnesota. They are generally of a local nature and when properly conducted are very successful from a financial point of view.

These comprise farmers' grain elevators, department stores, shipping associations, creameries and fruit-growing and shipping associations. A co-operative concern badly

Library of Congress

needed, of which there is but one in the state, at Chatfield, is a co-operative laundry to be constructed and operated in connection with the creamery or independent. The writer submitted a resolution favoring co-operative laundries to the committee on resolutions at the January, 1916, meeting of the State Federation of Farmer's Clubs, but to his surprise the resolution was never reported or acted upon. I hope the farm women who may read this article will take up the question and never let up until they have a laundry in every community, and they are free—forever free from the fearful drudgery of the wash tub. For one I will endeavor to do my part in keeping up the agitation.

The Equity Grain Elevator

One of the important moves of farmers in the line of co-operative is the plan for the co-operative terminal elevator. We have space here for only a brief sketch, but a full history of this movement should prove “mighty interesting reading” to any grain grower.

The American Society of Equity of our sister State of North Dakota deserves the credit for this enterprise. At first the idea prevailed that a big terminal elevator should be built and operated by the state, and on a referendum 83 per cent of her electors so voted. But the Legislature refused to appropriate the money and some of her resolute farmers started out with a paper asking subscriptions to stock so that the farmers might build the elevator themselves. Stock shares were fixed at \$50 each, with a maximum limit of twenty shares to any one person. Each shareholder had just one vote no matter how many shares he owned.

After many years of self-sacrificing effort on the part of a few courageous souls, the money was secured and a fine terminal elevator worth \$200,000 was erected on the banks of the Mississippi, in the city of St. Paul, and formally dedicated in December, 1916, in the presence of thousands of enthusiastic farmers. The Equity Exchange is the name of the company operating the plant.

Equity Exchange

The Exchange is governed by a board of directors chosen by the stockholders at each annual meeting. Mr. J. M. Anderson is president of the Exchange and J. G. Crites its efficient manager. The purpose of the Exchange is to provide a free market for the farmers' grain, where grain may be bought and sold under a competitive system, without paying a tribute in the form of commission to the Minneapolis or Duluth Board of Trade or Chamber of Commerce. As might be expected, the most savage assaults have been made upon the honor and integrity of the officers of this farmers' grain exchange, but while investigation after investigation have been ordered and carried out by the Legislature and by other bodies, it is but fair to say that the faith and confidence of the stockholders in the honesty and integrity and I might add in the efficient management of the officials of the Equity Grain Exchange has not been shaken in the least, and the business of the concern is rapidly increasing.

What has been Accomplished

You occasionally find an uninformed farmer who will ask: "What have these farmers' organizations accomplished for the good of the country, anyway?" For the benefit of this rapidly-decreasing class I will give a list of a few of the things that the organized farmers have been instrumental in securing, all of which though violently opposed at the time have been accepted by all classes as a settled policy.

1. For nearly fifty years the railroads of the country had been permitted to fix their own charges for the services they rendered, both for freight and passenger traffic. Discriminations and rebates were the order of the day and a gigantic system of organized bribery permeated every department of public life. It was the Grangers of Illinois, Iowa, Wisconsin, Minnesota and other states that forced railroad regulation by law from which those celebrated cases of *Minnesota vs. Illinois*, and *The Chicago, Burlington and Quincy Railroad vs. The State of Iowa*, sprung, in the determination of which cases the Supreme

Library of Congress

Court of the United States, the highest judicial authority, was reluctantly compelled—Justices Strong and Field dissenting—to confirm the right of a state and of Congress to regulate the charges of the railways for transportation services. This work alone is worth more than the Grange 69 ever cost. And I may add that following this up it was the Grange and the Alliance that finally compelled an unwilling Congress to enact the Interstate Commerce Laws, under which all free passes and discrimination of every character was prohibited. It was for a violation of this act that the Standard Oil Company was caught in the toils, convicted, and assessed the famous \$29,000,000 fine by Judge Kenesaw Mountain Landis of the Federal Court in Chicago.

2. The organized farmers may justly claim credit for the great Department of Agriculture at Washington, which now is presided over by a secretary and which has an equal standing in government with the treasury, the war or any other department.

3. Sixteenth Amendment to the Constitution, authorizing the laying of a graduated income tax had its origin in a farm organization and the solid support of all the organized farmers, and it may well be questioned whether or not without this support this important amendment could ever have been adopted.

4. The election of United States Senators by the direct votes of the people was one of the prominent planks in every state convention of farmers, and the sentiment thereby created finally crystallized into law and was made an integral part of the constitution, being known as the Seventeenth Amendment.

5. The free rural delivery of mail, which has proven a boon to farmers, and which no one living in the country and who possesses ordinary intelligence would be willing to give up, grew out of the agitation commenced in a farmers' meeting.

6. For about eighteen years we strove in our farm 70 organizations to secure the parcel post, which we finally obtained.

Library of Congress

7. In Minnesota, as all know, the Farmers' Alliance, after a contest lasting for years, and shaking up the state politically from one end to the other, compelled a reluctant Legislature to provide for the manufacture of binding twine and farm machinery by convicts at the state penitentiary at Stillwater, as noted elsewhere.

8. The farm organizations have accomplished a still greater work, which is just beginning to make itself manifest. They have broken down that bitter partisan feeling which unscrupulous politician so successfully capitalized for their own benefit. It used to be the proud boast of the unthinking farmer that he belonged to the republican or democratic party, as the case might be. Today there are at least 200,000 citizens in Minnesota, mainly farmers, who own their own votes and who "carry their manhood under their hats," and are proud of the fact. Indeed the amount of education along economic and political lines that has been carried on through the Grange, Society of Equity and farmers' clubs is almost inconceivable, and must ere long make its influence felt in better government.

9. Then we have laws taxing bogus butter, the Pure Food and Drug Act, requiring seedsmen to eliminate noxious weed seed from grain, and a host of reform legislation that I have not the space to mention, all of which has been championed and promoted by the farmers in their organized capacity.

I have been a member of farm organizations for forty-five years and have had some little hand in bringing about these results, and I am proud of the part that the members of the Grange, the Alliance, mutual benefit associations, 71 Society of Equity and farmers' clubs have taken in this line of human endeavor.

The Non-Partisan League

There is still another farmers' movement of recent origin that deserves more than a passing notice. It had its birthplace, in the State of North Dakota, where they do things. It is called the Non-Partisan League. Mr. A. C. Townley may rightfully claim to be the

Library of Congress

father of this organization. North Dakota is a purely agricultural state, 85 per cent of her people being engaged in farming. Small grain is the principal crop, and it is not likely that the people of any other state in the Union have been exploited and robbed as the long-suffering citizens of that state have been. But the worm will finally turn. Mr. Townley, who was formerly a Minnesota boy, had been a flax farmer near Beach, in the western part of that state, and having fallen a victim to the grain trust turned his attention to economic and political problems. He observed that lawyers, doctors, merchants, bankers and other classes were organized to promote and advance their own financial interests, although they kept mighty sly about it; and that the classes named financed the respective political parties to which they belonged and thereby controlled the policy of the party.

Since the interests of farmers as a class are identical, why could they not organize as farmers, just as lawyers organized as lawyers and bankers organized as bankers, and being largely in the majority, wrest the political control of the state from them and elect a farmer governor and a Legislature and other state officials, and a Supreme Court that would give the people a "square deal," as well as publish and own a newspaper that would tell the truth? The idea 72 grew with Mr. Townley and he became enthusiastic. He figured out that the sum of \$16 from each member would finance the movement. Mr. Townley met an enterprising young farmer named Howard Wood who fell in with the scheme and signed up, also a Mr. Bowen, who had been thinking along the same lines, and there were others. The old party bosses and well-fed editors laughed at the movement when they first heard of it. But the idea gained strength. Townley went on foot at first. Now he was able to use an automobile. Some well-to-do farmers were interested. Other cars were purchased and able speakers enlisted. A weekly paper, *The Non-Partisan Leader*, was started at Fargo, and sent to each member. Everyone who had put in his money naturally wanted to see the movement grow and to succeed. The present governor was a rich man and a banker. The Legislature, controlled by politicians, had contemptuously refused to appropriate money for a terminal elevator, in defiance of the mandate of the people, and farmers had been insolently told to "go home and slop the pigs."

Well, they went, but they kept thinking and when the day for the party primary rolled around the Non-Partisan Leaguers dropped their work and hastened to the school-houses and by the power of their numbers seized control of the party machinery and nominated or endorsed a whole list of candidates from governor down, and including all of the three members of the Supreme Court. And when election day came around they elected the entire state ticket, with a single exception, and three-fourths of the Lower House of the Legislature. One-half of the State Senate were holdovers, that is, they were elected two years ago, before the League had come into existence, and with a few 73 new members were able to delay for the present the program of the League. The purpose of the League is simple when once understood. It is the intention to use the power and authority of the state to give the people, and especially the farmers, a "square deal." To furnish and supply free and open markets for farm products.

While I have no connection with the Non-Partisan League, yet I feel that the farmers of the state should patiently investigate its aims and purposes and if these purposes are honest, just and deserving I see no reason why farmers should hesitate to finance a movement of this kind.

74

CHAPTER IX I MOVE TO MINNESOTA

In March, 1914, for the sake of my health I moved to Minnesota, locating at Pine River, Cass County, and went into the small fruit and dairy business on a farm adjoining the town. I felt I had done my share in the farmers' cause and had no thought of continuing the agitation, but farmers' clubs were all the rage then and the county agricultural agent, who had rooms at our house, asked me to go with him to a club meeting nearby. I was called upon to speak, and when I had finished a few minutes' talk the president of the club paid me a great compliment by saying it was the best farmers' speech he had ever listened to in his life. Other clubs nearby heard of it and I was soon in the harness again. These clubs, some thirteen hundred in number in the entire state, were organized under the direction

Library of Congress

of the Extension Division of the State Agricultural College, and were independent of each other. All of the alleged agricultural papers in the state encouraged them in this form. The single club was harmless politically. The Cass County clubs formed a County Federation, twelve clubs uniting, and elected me a "fraternal delegate" to all the other clubs in the state I might choose to visit. I soon had numerous calls coming from as far as Roseau County, in the northwest, to Fillmore County, in the south. To meet the demand I was compelled to arrange to spend the entire winter in the work. I addressed more than three hundred clubs altogether, covering every section of the state. 75 The agricultural papers, led by the *Farmers' Dispatch*, of St. Paul, were at first almost crazy to get reports of these meetings. But when the Cass County clubs, under my direction, passed resolutions favoring government ownership and operation of the railways, of the country, these alleged farmers' papers, save *The Farm Stock and Home*, suddenly became lukewarm, indifferent, or actually hostile to the further spread of the movement.

The Cass County clubs favored a state federation of all the clubs, and sent me as a delegate to an advisory meeting so called, which was held in January at the State Agricultural College building to either recommend or disapprove of a State Federation. The conservative forces, who did not desire the farmers to get together, were strongly in evidence at this meeting. Everybody who had even a buttonhole relation to farming was on hand supporting the conservative view that a state-wide class organization of farmers was dangerous, or at least not desirable.

A. D. Wilson, then the head of the Extension Service, presided, and we debated the question several hours a day for nearly a week.

We finally reached a vote on the question of having a State Federation and the result was a tie. Wilson voted with us, and the State Federation followed. I told Mr. Wilson at the time that his usefulness in connection with the agricultural school was greatly impaired in the estimation of the governing body, and he would soon have to seek another job. To day he

Library of Congress

is farming for himself up in Hubbard County. I want to add that A. D. Wilson is an honest man and will make good in any position to which he may be called.

It may be asked who provided for my salary during all 76 the time I spent in this work. To satisfy the curious I will say that salary I had none and my expenses were partly, possibly wholly, met by voluntary collections taken up at the meetings I addressed, or from the local treasury. I never drew fixed salary from the farmers in my life.

Just as men and women deeming it their duty have gone forth to teach the Gospel to benighted heathen, without pay, so have I been a missionary to those who till the soil for a living, striving to teach them the things they must know in order that they may be prosperous and happy. Those kindergarten lessons I gave paved the way for the Non-Partisan League, which soon followed.

My Lecture to the Farmers' Clubs

This is the substance of the talk I gave to the farmers at their club meetings, omitting some of the details and stories:

Ladies and Gentlemen:

I wish to in the beginning of this talk that no one sent me here. I came of my own free will because I felt I had a message to deliver that would be a benefit to my brother and sister farmers in an educational sense or way. Of that, you yourselves must be the judges. No one has any strings on me whatever. If I get any pay for this talk it will come as a free will offering from this audience; I am no politician. I never was a candidate for any public office, not even road supervisor or school director. While I have farmed all my life, I frankly confess that I never intended to be a farmer. I will tell you why. When I was a mere lad I lived with a farmer in Morrow County, Ohio, near where President Harding was born. One very hot day he was cultivating corn with one horse and an old double or single shovel plow. I followed with a hoe to cut out the weeds he missed. While we were sweltering in

Library of Congress

the hot sun a well dressed man drove by in a top buggy looking very comfortable. The farmer told me he was a doctor on his way to see a sick patient. I saw him going by daily. A short time afterward, on an equally hot day, another man drove 77 by in the same style buggy and also well dressed. I was told he was a lawyer going out to write a will for the doctor's patient. I saw him going back to town the same afternoon. Some days later, not seeing the doctor drive by any more, I asked why and was informed that his patient was dead. Here my inquisitive nature got busy; I wanted to know how much the doctor and the lawyer got for their services. I had previously learned that the tillers of the soil earned about \$1 per day and was amazed that the lawyer received \$10 for writing the will and the doctor \$300 for a month's attendance on a sick man who died. How much, I queried, would he have charged if he had cured him? The farmer said the difference between what he earned and what the attorney and the medical man realized for their services was all a matter education—that the educated classes got the better pay. “Me for an education,” I exclaimed. “You may bet I will not follow any old plow under the hot sun for a dollar a day, when, by acquiring an education, I can earn from ten to twenty times as much and ride around in top buggies on hot days and carry ice to keep me cool and comfortable.”

As the attorney had made money the fastest I decided to be a lawyer. Many years later when I had graduated from the law course and Drake University and was about to hang out my shingle in Des Moines, a doctor friend warned me that I had so impaired my health by my strenuous efforts to acquire an education that if I took up the practice of the law I might last six months, but by living an out door life and making fruit my principal diet, I would likely, in some measure, recover my health.

I tell you I was greatly disappointed, and I shed many bitter tears. I had intended to take cases against the big corporations exclusively and make a great record. But I finally decided that I would rather be a live farmer than a dead lawyer, so I went back to the farm and have been tilling the soil ever since.

Library of Congress

While in school I learned among other things that the educated classes, including bankers, doctors and lawyers, believed in organization along class lines to promote class interests. The thought came to me with irresistible force, that if these professional men found it to their advantage to so organize, why should not farmers follow their example. If the class that produces the food that feeds the world would fully organizer I could see clearly that they might then set their own price on the results of their labor, and make agriculture the most prosperous business in all 78 the land. So I began a systematic study of the farmers' life and opportunities. I attended every gathering of the tillers of the soil when possible, and listened patiently to the eloquent speakers who gave us so much free advice, and explained why farming was not a more prosperous business.

Right here I want to tell you how I got my "eye teeth" cut in a political sense. It may be of interest to some of you. The year after I became a legal voter I was out in the country about election time husking corn. We had a wonderful crop in that immediate section, averaging about 80 bushels per acre. Prices were very low, hogs about 3 cents and corn 30 cents. A silver tongued orator who wanted to go to Congress, and who, by the way got there, held a meeting near by to which all young voters were specially invited. I went. He said the cause of the low prices was "over production"; that farmers had got too greedy and produced more than could be consumed. "Next year," he said, "raise just half as much and you will get twice as much for it." Everybody shouted and the matter seemed to us all as clear as day.

But as you went north from where I worked, the country suddenly became rough and hilly, the crop only averaged about 20 bushels to the acre. We called it the "Barriers" and said their main crops up there were hoop poles and yellow dogs. Well, this eloquent speaker went up into this hoop pole country to speak the next night and I was so entranced with his logic and his eloquence that I followed him to hear him the second time. To my great astonishment, when he came to explaining the cause of the hard times where the crops were light he advised them to raise bigger crops so they would have more to sell and

Library of Congress

consequently get more money. In closing, I think he used about the following language: "If you have a fat hog, can't you get \$10 for it? If you have ten fat ones, can't you get \$100? Raise more fat hogs—that is the solution of the hard times problem." Well, he got the votes of about all who heard him, but mine—half of them because they raised twice too much and the others because they did not grow enough—for exactly opposite reasons. From that day to this I have not believed over half the politicians have told me, and I have often been puzzled to tell which half.

The business life of the farmer is now divided into three parts or divisions. These are: 1, production; 2, selling; 3, buying. How to grow the largest amount of the best quality of products 79 at the lowest relative cost, is the first problem that confronts very on of us farmers.

But we are getting advice and instruction by the foot, by the yard, by the rod, and even by the mile from almost everybody on matters that relate to production, so I will pass the problem by.

How to get my products in proper shape from the farm to the final consumer in the best markets of the world at the lowest possible cost is a problem that confronts everyone who tills the soil for a living. All are equally interested in its correct solution, but how many of us have given it any attention in the past? We sell less than seven per cent in value of our products directly to the consumer. Therefore we must dispose of more than 93 per cent through the medium of middlemen. The biggest of these middlemen are the railroads, the meat packers, and the get flouring mills. We hire the railways to transport our products; we employ the packers to put our fat hogs, cattle and sheep in shape for consumption; we use the millers to put our grains in the form of foodstuffs. Every one of these classes would indignantly resent the idea that he is the farmer's hired man. In truth, he is not, but should be.

Library of Congress

The prosperity of the railroad depends on the amount of traffic and the freight rate. The prosperity of the packer on the price he pays the produce for the raw material. The millers' well being, depends on how cheaply they can purchase the farmers' grain. As a rule, the cheaper they can get the raw products of the farm, the greater their profits.

Is it not plain to be seen that the greater the prosperity of these middlemen, the less prosperous the farmers will be? Government experts who have investigated the matter tell us that middlemen get 63 cents of the consumer's dollar, while the producer gets only 37 cents. Yet, there are intelligent men who pretend to wonder why farming is not a more prosperous business! The plain blunt truth of the matter is that farmers are little more than the hired men of these big interests; or to put it in other words, these great corporations have gotten between us and the consumers and compel us to employ them and then permit them to put their own price on the services they render us. This system has grown up through a long series of years by the active assistance of your politicians and your State Legislature and especially your Congress. These big interests and allied concerns 80 largely finance both of the great political parties, write their platforms and dictate their policies.

That prosperity which is due the farmer will never come to him until this system of distribution is radically changed.

This change can only be effected through politics. *There is no limit to human greed*, and I predict that the farmer will be squeezed tighter and tighter until he becomes desperate.

Now, can this be brought about through politics, you say? Easy enough! Let the government acquire possession of the railways and operate them treating everybody alike as is done by the postoffice, the basis of cost of the service, then through co-operative flouring mills and packing plants, farmers can put their products in shape for consumption and then dispose of them through their own selling agencies in the great centers of population. The big fellows plainly see how this could be done and that is why they are so

Library of Congress

bitterly opposed to government ownership of the transportation system of this country. In my judgment, if this great change could only be effected it would make agriculture the best paying business in America.

I am not predicting that this change will surely come to pass in our day. Great revolutions com slowly. But farmers, through concessions, will materially improve their condition if they keep the matter before the public.

In the matter of buying, again, the tillers of the soil get the worst of the deal. Ordinarily a manufacturer of farm machinery figures out the cost of his product, then adds what he deems a fair profit and sells it to the wholesaler or jobber. The latter then adds his own profit and sells to the retailer. Then the local man adds to the price he paid, the transportation charges and his own margin of profits, and the farmer walks up and pays the entire bill in the price of the machine to him.

Occasionally the farmer has risen in his wrath and made an effort by legislation to reduce the cost of something. A great turmoil has always followed. Here in Minnesota, it was thought that binding twine could be made by convict labor at the state penitentiary and sold blow the price charged by the concerns that had a monopoly of the business, but the attempt caused a great political upheaval. The farmers finally won.

It may be depend on—taken for granted—that every movement of a political nature designed to benefit the farmers or make life for them a little easier, will be strenuously resisted by the 81 privileged classes. The history of the past fully verifies this assertion.

In once attended a meeting where the audience was composed entirely of farmers, that was addressed by two old party speakers in the nature of a joint debate. One of them was sure all the farmers needed to make them happy and prosperous was a high tariff to protect our markets for their products. The other was equally certain that free trade with all the world would make agriculture in America “bloom and blossom as the rose.” Well, the audience divided in the middle and cheered their respective champions to the limit. I

Library of Congress

remained silent. A young man who was also attending school, asked me why. I told him they reminded me of the following story: An Irishman who was near-sighted, visiting a little town, thought a man he saw across the street was an old chum of his he knew back in Ireland. So he got a broad smile on his face, stuck out his hands and rushed over to meet him. The other fellow also happened to be near-sighted, and seeing this action took the fellow from Cork to be an old friend of his he left back in Indiana. When they came up close together they discovered that they were total strangers and the Irishman said, "Faith, indeed, ain't that quare, I thought it was you and you thought it was me, and it is nayther of us." Neither of these proposed measures will insure prosperity. What every farmer in this house wants above all other things of a political nature, is the assistance of the government in getting his products from the farm to the ultimate consumer in the best markets of the world at the lowest possible cost; and neither speaker alluded to this important matter at all. So long as the man who tills the soil is required or consents to employ a gang of middlemen to aid him in marketing what he grows and allows them to take two-thirds of it to pay for finding a market for the balance agriculture will languish and farming will be a poor paying business.

Well, I believe they did just what the politicians wanted them to do on election day—split their votes in the middle, 49 on each side. I made fun of them. I told them instead of spending the time going to the polls to kill each other's vote they had all better staid at home and helped their wives put out the family washing, or even got together and matched pins with each other, it would have had the same effect. But as one remarked, "They voted their principles anyway."

The great trouble with the farmer is he has not studied politics 82 from the bread and butter standpoint as, say lawyers, doctors and bankers have done.

If farming has been carried on under the conditions I have outlined, some one might ask why farmers have been able to do as well as they have done. There are three principal factors or reasons. First, there has been a gradual increase in the value of their holdings,

due to the settlement of the country. Second, the fertility of the soil is the farmers' capital. Crops use up and exhaust this fertility, and it should be replaced. This has not been done in many instances, or as a rule, as the numerous abandoned once fertile farms amply attest. Third, the long hours of labor and the work of the wife and the children.

And finally, if you would prosper, you must do your own thinking and it must be along class lines.

The reading of this address should show the reader that in my talks to the farmers I did not attempt to conceal anything.

83

CHAPTER X MY CAREER AS THE CORNFIELD PHILOSOPHER

While living at Spicer I was looking over the "Knocks and Boosts" column of the *St. Paul Daily News*, and noticed a letter, ostensibly from a woman, asking advice from the readers of the paper as to whether or not she should apply for a divorce because "her husband hugged and kissed her too much." I thought this was the limit of silliness and I answered it in a way that attracted wide attention. This is what I wrote:

Editor, *Daily News*: I see the papers that a woman has applied for a divorce from her husband because he hugs and kisses her too often. That divorce should be granted without delay. Any man who makes it a daily practice to hug and kiss his own wife should be speedily separated from the object of his too ardent affections. It generally spoils women to hug and kiss them. Then if a husband hugs and kisses his own wife, is it not presumptive that he will steal the opportunity to hug and kiss all the lovely widows and unfortunate old maids he may chance to meet or even extend his osculatory attentions to the wives of other men? We are entering upon a new era as far as women are concerned and a law should speedily passed to protect unwilling wives from the too amorous attentions of their husbands.

No woman should be hugged and kissed by any man, except on her direct invitation. If a woman should say, "You may kiss me, John," would it not make the kiss all the sweeter?

In the effort to think of some name to sign to this article, "The Cornfield Philosopher," came to my mind. The signature pleased me and I have used it ever since.

I followed this up with other suggestions to, and concerning women, some of which are here given.

84

LET WOMEN COURT

Editor, *Daily News*: I am frightened at the rapid, the alarming increase of unhappiness in married life. The happy married couple is the exception now rather than the rule. This is not according to the design of our Creator, so there must be both a cause and a remedy.

I am not going to quote the Bible on this subject because that would be old-fashioned and out of date and is regarded largely as mere mythology.

In the days of "Brave Lochinvar" women loved men for their bravery, for their ability to protect their wives from all harm. In past ages warriors always had the most happy and devoted helpmeets. But fighters are now at a discount, and soldiers don't get anywhere in loving making compared to men with fat pocket-books.

I am going to venture to suggest that women be allowed to do most of the courting and to "pop the question" as an exclusive right. In that case, married men hereafter would not be apt to go wrong, since no woman think of asking a man to marry her unless she really loved him, and a good, kind, loving wife at home is a strong incentive to man to keep in the straight and narrow way. Then if a girl should happen to make a mistake in selecting a husband, her pride and her faith in her own good judgment would almost compel her to keep still about the matter.

Library of Congress

Moreover, women after being granted the privilege of selecting their consorts or better halves should not be allowed to apply for a divorce. This restriction should make them circumspect and discreet and wise and also a little slow in making their decisions.

Then consider what a tremendous influence this arrangement would have in regulating the habits and the morals of young men. In order to stand in with the girls or even be on speaking terms with any of them, the boys would have to cast aside their cigarettes, stop using cuss words, keep away from the gambling tables and become regular attendants at the Sunday school, as well as acquire regular habits of industry and economy.

I am not going to copyright this idea. I modestly submit and commend this notion of mine to all women's clubs and to advanced thinkers of both sexes. To do away with this fast increasing unhappiness in married life is certainly an object to be greatly desired and one worthy the most earnest consideration of the 85 brightest minds. I may have more to say on this subject in the future after I have found a few wives who did the proposing and are satisfied with the results.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

GIVE THEM LIBERTY

Editor, *Daily News*: Why all this criticism of girls and women? If this is kept up, will they not become calloused and hard-hearted and maybe indifferent as to their looks? Heaven forbid!

All persons of the female gender should be allowed every liberty and freely accorded any privilege they may wish to exercise without question. Every woman, or even girl, is bound to fall in love with something or somebody. The Lord made her that way and she just can't help herself. If she likes cosmetics or short skirts or bobbed hair or even to privately smoke

Library of Congress

a cigaret it may keep her from being attracted to some worthless man and giving him a love he does not deserve and may betray.

Young girls seldom fall in love with undeserving men if allowed to follow the bend of their own minds. They generally experiment with things named above or with cats and dogs, which is usually harmless, until the right man comes along.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

A HINT FROM THE PHILOSOPHER

Editor, *Daily News*: If discontented "Puzzled Twenty-two" wishes to be real happy, let her get in love with some member of the male persuasion and prove this fact to him by her looks and acts. Don't select a person that some other female has filed a claim on. Most any lone man of any age is perfectly willing down deep in his heart that any girl of twenty-two may take a special interest in him if she is truly in earnest.

No woman is really happy unless she is in love with some man. I have often wondered why so many of the gentler sex are ignorant of this great truth and try to find happiness in some other way. They always fail.

If this discontented young lady lived nearby and she wanted to experiment on the line suggested, and no other person was available to whom she might take a fancy, in order to prove that my theory is correct and the remedy never failing, I might permit her 86 to begin with my humble self. I hold that all men should sacrifice themselves in this manner, if necessary, to make all womankind contented and happy.

Spicer, Minn. — the Cornfield Philosopher.

ADVICE TO WOMEN

Library of Congress

Editor, *Daily News*: Although I am only a backwoodsman, I desire to see everybody happy, especially all womankind. To meet a real happy woman is a great joy to me. This is the reason why I give so much free advice to the gentler sex. The only real happy females I have met held in their bosoms a great secret which they tried their best to conceal, but which shone out grand and glorious in the radiant faces. They were all supremely in love with some fortunate men.

“Puzzled Twenty-two” will be no longer at sea when she meets her affinity. Her case is not yet hopeless. I have known women as much as 25 to marry happily and ladies even older than that, though they may have forgotten some of their birthdays, may have entered that blissful state.

Don't look for a career. Careers are delusive and lead anywhere but to happiness. Just look for the man who deep down in his heart will regard you (even if you have a few faults) as the pink of womanly perfection, and finding him, all other good things will come into your life that you may deserve.

I have always wondered why preachers have been a little shy in proclaiming this great truth from the pulpit. It is not so plain and simple and so closely connected with the well-being of the human race.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

RIGHT TO SELECT HUSBANDS

Editor, *Daily News*: Now that women have been invested with the elective franchise I am in favor of going the limit and granting them, by special permission, the right to select their husbands. Women were created to serve men, but each woman should have the right to select the particular man she delights to honor. If every woman was imbued with the idea that the individual to whose welfare and happiness she was devoting her whole life as the most complete specimen of exalted manhood the good Lord ever created, she would be

Library of Congress

indescribably happy and divorces would be unknown. Woman's instinct would lead her to make the right selection in 99 cases out of a hundred. Then there are lots of old bachelors pining away in a state of solitary loneliness, because of excessive timidity, who would never have had the courage to say no to a plain proposal.

I am a little diffident myself and hesitate to carry on this discussion, but the hint I have thrown out here should be sufficient for some of the numerous clubs organized to ameliorate the condition of mankind. There may be a few old maids as well as bachelors that would derive a benefit from the adoption of these broad views on so important a matter.

Spricer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

FIRST CHOICE

Editor, *Daily News*: I see that some pessimistic moralists are insinuating pretty broadly that our girls and young women are not equal to their grandmothers, either in personal charms or in their general deportment and manners. Does it not stand to reason that our young women, having all the natural beauty possessed by the gentler sex in any age of the world and the aid of artificial beautifiers entirely unknown until recent years—I say, is not evident that they are more attractive in personal appearance than their ancestors of the female line. Otherwise, face lotions and powders and things of that nature would be of little or no value and what woman will admit this?

Formerly women yielded that obedience to the “lords of creation” that they promised at the marriage altar. Sometimes becoming impatient in waiting for the right man, they accepted the wrong fellow. Then they became dull and unattractive and maybe occasionally cross. Today they are independent, many of them drawing salaries sufficient to support a husband and family.

There is just one thing we yet need to do. Let us educate public opinion to the point that girls will be justified in selecting their own life companions as a matter of right and not, as is now the custom, have to merely make a choice from among those who apply. No female ever goes wrong who lives with the object of her affections, and men seldom depart from the straight and narrow way, except healthy, normally developed women naturally desires a man to look after and care for, and if allowed to take their pick they would all, or nearly all, make a wise choice.

88

Nothing makes a girl so charming as having a young man “on the string” ready to respond to her beck and call, and maybe take orders. Even older women are greatly improved in appearance by becoming interested—the more the better—in some human being of the opposite sex. There are just a few wives who broke away from the conventionalities and chose their husbands and they will admit that they are the happiest women in the world.

I will agree to pay the expenses of every divorce where the woman married her first choice, that fact being admitted or proven.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

IF IT WILL WORK

Editor, *Daily News*: My recent suggestion that as a sure cure for marital infelicity and unhappiness, females should have the right to choose their own life companions, has brought forth no end of commendations from all classes, except a few happily mated couples. The girls are simply bubbling over with enthusiasm. The old maids are fairly beside themselves with joy at the proposition and the widows are not far behind. Timid old bachelors quietly pat me on the shoulder and say, “It would be a mighty good thing it if will only work.”

Even married men who silently admit that they made a poor choice give me great encouragement.

So far I have not noticed any criticism whatever in *The Daily News* which is a good sign that I am on the right track. Some day soon I hope a brave, bold lassie will exercise this privilege and set the example. If I were a younger man and better looking, I might modestly suggest that if really necessary some fair damsel might begin with me rather than the experiment should fail.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

LET THE WOMEN CHOOSE

Editor, *Daily News*: I see that some grumbler is complaining of women holding positions that could be as well or better filled by men, thereby depriving some man of a job by which he could earn a living for his family. I can't see it in that light. These women are more kind-hearted and gracious and much more obliging, so far as my experience goes, than men, and fully as competent to perform the duties.

89

I consider that it is the prime or first duty of every girl or woman to keep up a constant warfare with dirt, and to make some man happy. But holding public positions where they daily meet with many of the male persuasion enables girls to make a far better selection of a life companion than those unfortunates confined to the kitchen, who must take anyone who happens along. I insist that if we assign the duty making some man happy to every female that she should have the privilege of making the selection. Is there anything wrong in that?

Then why cannot these ladies holding positions adapted to men become heads of families themselves and arrange for their husbands to remain at home and keep house and do chores and make life easy for the bread-winner.

I just drop these suggestions for wiser heads than mine to consider.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

WOULD LET GIRLS CHOOSE MATES

Editor, *Daily News*: It is admitted by all that divorces are frightfully increasing and marital infelicity and unhappiness are wellnigh universal.

As a man I will concede that the male sex is incompetent when it comes to choosing a life companion, hence so many misfits. Women are gifted with an unerring instinct which if they were allowed, I might say, encouraged to follow, would guide them right.

A woman should not and really cannot be expected to devote her whole life to making a man happy unless she be allowed to select the object of her affections. If the woman of the family truly loves her husband, does anything go wrong with that couple? Never!

Even Xantippe, the wife of that wise man, Socrates, reputed to be the greatest scolder ever known, might have been a model woman if she had only married a fool.

Let the girls have their choice in this most important of all matters to them and I will stand responsible for the results.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

LET THE GIRLS CHOOSE

Library of Congress

Editor, *Daily News*: I am surprised at the reception my recent article on the right of women to choose their own life companions 90 has met with. About everybody agrees with me except a few fortunate ladies who selected their own husbands on the sly. These women seem to think that if the girls nowadays are as cute as they were, there is no necessity of making the matter public.

Another reason I have for establishing this custom is the effect it would have on young men in the way of improving their morals. No young woman would think of selecting a dopester, cigaret field, gambler, bandit or a lazy man, especially the latter, for a life companion. These classes, therefore, would entirely disappear. Now, unfortunately, they are largely on the increase.

Women are coming in for their rights and I am in favor of going the limit. Our defects in social life and in government are nearly all due to our failure to fully utilize the wisdom, good sense and moral power and example on the fair sex.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

INFLUENCING LADY VOTERS

Editor, *Daily News*: Somebody disputed my statement that women are prone to fall in love. Ah, that is putting it rather strong. I mean to admire military titles and bold, brave soldiers. Has this not just been proven by the great vote the ladies have given "Colonel" Leach for mayor of Minneapolis? And what appealed to them more than his military record? I doubt if the colonel would have been elected by the male voters alone.

Every time we run a candidate with a military record and title against a pacifist or maybe a slacker, we can depend on the patriotic female voters to come across with the necessary support. If the women in general should once take up with this disarmament idea, as I confess a few seem to be doing, they might give us lots of trouble. Then, our military men

Library of Congress

are usually good looking and make a nice appearance on parade and in society, and this counts heavily with the lady voters.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

THE CONTROLLING FACTOR

Editor, *Daily News*: "Can a girl come back?" asks "A Prodigal Girl." Does not that depend on how far she has gone and in what direction? I take it for granted, however, that she has departed from "the straight and narrow way" and strayed into by and by forbidden paths. We are told that "while the lamp holds out to burn, the vilest sinner may return."

If the lamp of her life has not been extinguished, she surely can come back. But she must come humbly and contritely and be patient. When women fall, it is usually through their great love for somebody or something. Men sometimes do wrong things on account of a wicked nature. Women seldom or never.

Love is, or should be, the great controlling factor in woman's life. If you have erred through love and misplaced confidence you can easily come back. Begin by loving some worthy object—your own mamma, for instance. Don't tell your errors to anyone but to your Creator. If we should all get on the housetops and proclaim and publish our faults as loudly and persistently as we do our virtues, when we have any, this act would inspire a spirit of pessimism, if not despair in every human soul. Another era of the dark ages would speedily follow.

If any man should bestow his affections upon you, he should love you for what you really are and not for what you have been. Even I, myself, would hate to tell of all my escapades in my youth and early manhood, and yet I was the adopted son of a preacher who devoutly believed with Solomon, "If you spare the rod you spoil the child."

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

FALLING IN LOVE WITH HUBBY

Editor, *Daily News*: I try to make all of my statements “self-evident truths” that no one will feel like contradicting, but here comes “Another Farmer;s Wife” and appears to want to find fault with me because I advised a “Farmer's Wife” to fall in love with her husband. Now I thought that was perfectly safe advice to offer. I never knew a woman to get in trouble because she thought too much of her own husband. Now women don't amount to anything and are hard to get along with unless they are in love with somebody or something. And what more proper object can a married woman center her affections upon than the partner of her joys and sorrows.

A woman who truly loves her husband does not rush into the newspapers and advised girls on the lookout for a man never to marry one who farms for a living, that being the occupation of the one she married. On the contrary, she bravely shoulders her 92 share of life's and burdens and encourages her husband in every way she can, thus becoming a true helpmeet.

But “Another Farmer's Wife” intimates that I am opposed to progress. Perish the thought! I have advocated and supported every reform that has been adopted in this country in the last fifty years, and I have even favored some reforms that have not yet been accepted.

It may be a little old-fashioned to advice a woman to get in love with her husband, but that is one of the old customs that will always exist in spite of everything. When some harm comes from this practice, let me know and give the particulars.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

THE PHILOSOPHER'S SOLUTION

Editor, *Daily News*: I have been looking for some sensible solution in your paper for the “delinquency of girls” problem, but no one has yet come forward with the proper remedy. I

Library of Congress

am somewhat diffident and backward about asserting myself, as my early education was more or less neglected. Nevertheless, I am going to offer a few suggestions:

Girls don't get drunk or steal or turn bandits when they go wrong. They generally tempt or mislead some man into forbidden paths. Now, men have fallen through the wiles of women since the days of Father Adam. He set the example and all of his male descendants have followed in his footsteps. They are built that way and they just can't help it.

The opportunities for girls to tempt men used to be limited. In the days of our grandmothers for a man to be tempted by a woman and fall was a nine day's wonder, and the guilty female was ostracized and driven out of decent society. Everybody shunned her and and she was made to feel that she had committed the "unpardonable" offense.

In the olden time girls only met men under the eyes of their mammas or grandmothers. They had not learned how to tempt men as well as they know now. The only remedy (as I see it) is to teach girls from their cradles up what a great sin it is to smile at men or flirt with them. Or, as an alternative, to raise only homely, frowsy, sour-visaged, unattractive girls that men won't notice. None of this class, so far as I have observed, ever go wrong where there is a man concerned in the case, and the delinquency of the female always involves some man.

93

Of course, men might, when more boys, learn that all women have designs on them and be put on their guard, but they have fallible memories and are prone to forget their early teachings, especially when tempted by the fair sex.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

WOMEN AND PEACE.

Library of Congress

Editor, *Daily News*: "Plague take the women voters of the West," says Secretary of War Weeks, and Secretary of Navy Denby agrees with him. Both have planned to insure the world peace for all future time by making these United States the most warlike nation on the earth, and now these women voters of St. Paul and Minneapolis have presumed to question their wisdom. What are we coming to, anyway?

Women may set themselves up over men in the home and in the church with some claims of priority and of right, maybe. But to meet in convention and pass resolutions antagonizing the settled policy of this administration, on the part of these newly-enfranchised voters, is, to say the least, certainly presumptuous. The Negroes did not meet in solemn convention and tell the white people what to do, did they, when given the ballot? Then why should the women?

Of course the \$40,000,000 spent on a big battleship would buy a \$40 hat or dress for a million women, but the Government has no right to spend to people's money in that manner.

If these women, by interfering with the plans of the men, prevent a disarmament of all the rest of the nations of the world except America, we will heartily wish we had never given them the ballot. We can only secure peace by being able and prepared to trounce any country that starts trouble. Women ought to know this from their own experience. When a woman has a rolling pin or broomstick handy and a disposition to use them on proper occasions doesn't she have peace in her own family?

Is it not a shame that western congressmen who favor these big battleships and liberal appropriations for the army are going to meet the opposition of the solid female vote? If this nation becomes sissified, even life Costa Rica or Panama will laugh at us.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

WOMEN AND WAR

Editor, *Daily News*: Some hare-brained fellow connected with an eastern college has forbidden the girls in the institution to attend the drills of the cadets when taking their lessons in military training. I trust his example will not be followed by others. There is no real pleasure among Christian people in learning how to kill their fellow men, but we cannot allow this knowledge to be monopolized by the heathen. The charm in learning the rules and methods of warfare consists in having lovely women stand by and applaud. If women do not approve of war it will become mighty unpopular, I fear, which would be deplorable indeed.

Many super-patriotic Americans have set their hearts on this country's becoming the greatest military nation in the world, and the art of war must, therefore, be taught in our schools and colleges. Congress is doing its part by appropriating nearly a billion dollars to support and extend the army and navy, and is it not unpatriotic for any measly pacifist who happens to be a college professor to throw cold water on the movement in this manner? If given proper encouragement Congress may provide for compulsory military training at every institution of learning, but the girls must be allowed to witness and enjoy the maneuvers of the young warriors, or the boys will take no interest in their work along this line.

Universal, worldwide disarmament may be a good thing, but so long as Greece or Patagonia continues to teach its citizens how to fight, how dare nations like the United States or Great Britain neglect preparations for self-defense? And if we are going to defend ourselves can we be too well prepared?

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

At length I turned my sarcastic pen to the general situation and the political conditions then existing. The following are a few of my productions along this line:

THAT MAN CALDERWOOD

Editor, *Daily News*: The most dangerous man in Minnesota today to the “big business interests,” upon which we all depend for a living, is that man W. G. Calderwood. He will have to be reckoned with in the future. He is a troublemaker, and if 95 the good Lord does not remove him from our midst he is sure to break our campaign slate at the next election. If we had not succeeded in dragging that big and brainy lawyer and successful trust-buster, Frank Kellogg, out of his den, and raised enough money by penny collections to place his picture in every store window in the state, along with the placard, “A Big Man for a Big Job,” Calderwood might have broken into the United States Senate!

When Uncle Knute Nelson retires two years hence on account of age, it will be just like this Calderwood to jump into the campaign again, and with the help of the 60,000 friends he has already back of him, and it being an “off year,” we will have the fight of our lives to suppress him! We have only two men left who would stand any show to beat him. These are George H. Sullivan and W. W. Dunn.

There is just one weak point in this Calderwood. He is no lawyer. If we sent him down to Washington, he could not earn any money “on the side,” by acting as an attorney for the trusts, and would have to live on his salary!

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

TIMBER SCALING PLANS

Editor, *Daily News*: I understand that the state auditor proposes to change the plan of “scaling” or estimating the quantity and value of state timber.

It has been intimated that heretofore this work has been an easy job for the timber cruiser, who picked out one tree, generally of the smallest size, counted the number on one acre

Library of Congress

where they appeared scattering, and multiplied this by the number of acres to be put on the market, and the thing was done.

Now, or hereafter, each individual tree will be scaled in the following manner, as I understand it: The cruiser will climb to the top of the tree on a ladder, or go up in an airship, whichever is the more convenient, drop a line to the ground to ascertain its height, then measure each tree at the top and in the middle and square the length and thickness, thus reducing each tree to "board measure."

Each tree will be sold separately by a special auctioneer, so there will be no chance for the lumber trust (if there is such a thing) to get in its work.

About two trees a day would be the average for each person 96 employed, so there will be lots of jobs for the politicians and men of leisure who like to spend their summers in the north woods. 'Tis true it might take \$1,000,000 or such a matter to pay for this work, but then we would know to a dot just how much timber we sell and the price realized for the same, which ought to be some satisfaction to the citizens living in the southern part of the state, who have to buy lumber.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

HIGHLY IMPROBABLE!

Editor, *Daily News*: It was been reported to me that there is a suspicion hovering around the office of the state forester that somebody has been making a little free with the state timber, and the forester wants \$100,000 or so to find out about it. Doesn't this timber belong to our school fund, and who would be so unpatriotic as to steal the property used to educate his own children? Surely no citizen of Minnesota!

Then who could steal this timber and get away with it except the big lumber companies? Perish the thought that they would do such a thing. It stands to reason that if such a thing

Library of Congress

were possible, we would have heard something about it long ago, for haven't we always had honest, vigilant and capable men to look after this business?

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

NO OFFICE IN SIGHT

Editor, *Daily News*: There is no office in sight for me, not for two years at least, or until we get a new governor. Straight party men are hooked for all the jobs the governor has up his sleeve. My record, at present, is a little crooked. I once voted for a measly populist for postmaster out of pure kindness of heart, because I thought mine would be the only vote he would get, but I miscalculated and he was elected by one vote! That has been laid up against me!

I also supported a democrat (who got religious at a revival meeting, because I wanted to encourage him to walk in the straight and narrow way) for town marshal and poundkeeper about forty years ago, and he was elected through my influence. I am, therefore, a black sheep in the political fold and must go into enforced retirement till needed in the next campaign. My political sins 97 have surely found me out even at this late day. I must suffer for my early indiscretions.

Well, maybe the governor cannot find jobs enough even for the faithful, and more deserving, so I ought not to complain.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

THE HEROES WHO SLEW THE TONNAGE TAX

Editor, *Daily News*: Thank goodness, we have stopped the tonnage tax bill in the Senate, and now, my friends, the steel magnates may rest easy for the next two years. Senator George H. Sullivan of Stillwater did it with his masterly eloquence. Senator Putnam of Faribault helped him a little by intimating that the state would not know what to do with all

Library of Congress

this tax money, about \$2,000,000 a year, and might spend it for ice cream and other knick-knacks. Minneapolis and St. Paul both came nobly to our assistance with a solid vote. We expected it of the Mill City, but were doubtful about the capital.

But horrors of horrors, suppose the pesky Non-Partisan Leaguers should make the tonnage tax vote an issue (and I am sorry to say they are likely to do it), what will happen to the future political aspiration, if they have any (I hope they haven't), of Senators Andrews of Mankato, Campbell of Mower, Duxbury of Houston, Hanson of Norman, Glatzbach of Rice, Hegnes of Marshall, Holmberg of Renville, Lende of Yellow Medicine, Peterson of Clay, Putnam of Blue Earth, Ries of Scott, Rustad of Traverse, Bystrom of Chicago, Ole Sageng of Ottertail (who would have expected it of him?) and Swenson of Freeborn? All of these district are morally certain to be overrun by the League before the next election. Senator Sullivan is pretty sure to be sent to the United State Senate to succeed Uncle Knute Nelson, if we don't slip a cog in our plans, but we don't have jobs like that for all the rest of the faithful.

Spicer, Minn — The Cornfield Philosopher.

WHAT TEDDY COULD DO

Editor, *Daily News*: It was a great mistake that Roosevelt was not elected president in 1912. I thought so at the time and now I am sure of it. If we had been chosen president, the kaiser would never have dared to begin the war when he did by invading Belgium. If a little delay had followed, King Wilhelm would 98 have seen the futility of his hopes, and the certainty of having this great republic to deal with, led by the most redoubtable warrior of modern times. His heart would have failed him and he would have cried for peace on almost any terms! If Roosevelt had been president when the war started we would have had 10,000,000 of trained men in the trenches in Europe before the end of a year, and a lasting peace treaty would have been signed long ago.

Library of Congress

Even now, if he were made lieutenant-general and given free rein with all the resources of this country at his disposal, there is no reason to doubt but what he would end the war, say, within three months. If peace does not come before 1920, Teddy will be certain to run on a peace platform and be elected, of course, and America will get the credit of restoring peace and order in a war-crazed world!

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

HAS A JOB

Editor, *Daily News*: I had intended to go over the wilds of Itaska County and hire out as a lumberjack for the winter, or to shoot “at” the I. W. W.’s when they got too obstreperous, but to my astonishment a gentleman in the Twin Cities, who modestly calls himself the “superintendent of legislation,” has asked me to review bills—in short, to help him run the Legislature. He says I can stay right here by my own fireside and continue my pastime of feeding deer along my back fence (we raise about 1,000 deer during each year in Cass County to entertain our city friends during the hunting season, and I want to do my share), and put in my spare time reviewing bills that he will send as fast as printed. I am to O. K. them and suggest amendments.

He tells me he can't do anything in the House. That the boys refer everything to what he calls a “Farmer's Forum,” and my O. K. would do a bill no good and might even do harm. But in the Senate he thinks that the thing will work out to perfection. I confess that I have serious doubts about the august senators paying any attention whatever to my recommendations, but as the job is more congenial than slashing around in the deep snows of the pine woods, I am going to try the thing out, at least as long as the checks come regularly. Just why he has selected 99 me as an assistant superintendent of legislation I cannot understand. It is a compliment I do not deserve.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

IS CONGRESS FOOLISH?

Editor, *Daily News*: And now Congress has “played politics” to perfection, and actually refused permission to “Terrible Teddy” to cross over to the scene of hostilities with a legion of Rough Riders to “throw a scare” into the Germans and thus end this horrible war. What can Congress mean? Who knows but what if Teddy could only be properly encouraged he might be able to load up 100,000 trained warriors into those big British tanks and drive straight across the famous Hindenburg line and over any Teutons foolish enough to get in the way, until he reached the palace of Potsdam, and there dictate terms of peace that would be satisfactory to all concerned, and return with his victorious army in time to join with all America in a monster Fourth of July celebration? He seems to be willing to make the effort, the legions are anxious to go, the tanks have no objection, everybody wants peace, and apparently nothing but stupid, perverse—and I had almost said disloyal—Congress stands in the way. Suppose these heroic deeds should make him president. Wouldn't he deserve the job?

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

OBJECTS TO FORD'S ACTIVITIES

Editor, *Daily News*: Henry Ford has been broken loose again. He wants to pay about \$15,000,000 income tax to finance the war. But he has a string to the offer which greatly worries my friends, the big interests. He insists that all shall pay in the same proportion. Were it not for the war profits, between Henry Ford and the Non-Partisan League, life, for my friends, would hardly be worth the living! Why worry successful men to death simply because they have been forehanded and accumulated some few of the treasures of the earth? If Henry had his way the expenses of the war would be met by taxing the rich and well-to-do, and the common people would have no opportunity to show their patriotism by purchasing a liberty bond, for none would be issued. And I am afraid that if the league gets the run of things there will be no profits to tax, that is, no big profits. Whoever heard, 100

Library of Congress

before the days of Henry Ford, of a rich man inviting the tax gatherer to make him a visit? Ford must have been associating with some pesky socialists at some time in his life, for he surely has absorbed many of their foolish notions.

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

THE RAILWAY MERGER

Editor, *Daily News*: My friends, the railway magnates, and bondholders, have done a mighty cute thing. It is just what I was going to suggest, only I was a little slow. I was busy preparing for my hay crop and praying for rain. I had thought the scheme all out, however. But now I am afraid I will lose the credit! Heretofore, to accommodate the public, we have been running trains between long distance points on the various lines about fifteen minutes apart, with the cars mostly empty, the laws would not even allow us to have congressmen and politicians as deadheads for ballast. But from now on, we propose to make people wait until we have a full train load and then send them over the different lines in rotation so each one will get its proper share of the business!

We have practically merged all the lines into one and under the same management. We had to do this to show our patriotism! Now we can lick the Non-Partisan League or any combination of farmers and shippers, so if you want a scrap, just come on! As almost everything else except common labor has increased in price about 200 per cent, why should not transportation? Not only are we going to save about \$500,000,000 by this "merger," but we will likely get a healthy increase in rates, enough, I hope, to add \$1,000,000,000 to our income. We need it to meet the high cost of living. This new plan is surely a great scheme even if I do not get the credit of devising it. I don't intend to get caught napping again!

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

SUSPICIOUS OF TOWNLEY

Library of Congress

Editor, *Daily News*: I must confess that A. C. Townley, the head of the Non-Partisan League, is giving us lots of trouble and the end is not in sight. What does he want of state-owned elevators and flour mills in North Dakota unless he intends to pay higher for wheat and to sell flour cheaper and thus 101 cut, our profits at both ends of the line? The farmers seem to follow him around as if he were another Abraham Lincoln, intent on freeing a lot of the people from slavery!

They tell me that Minnesota farmers are joining this league at the rate of about 1,000 per day, which is surely going some. Heretofore we have been in partnership in politics with the tillers of the soil and other laborers, which has worked well for us. We have dictated the party policy, named the candidates and supplied the “sinews of war”—financed the enterprise, so to speak; all the others had to do was to carry the torchlights, do the shouting and incidentally furnish the votes! Now the farmers insist on writing the platform, nominating the candidates, and putting up a campaign fund in the hands of Mr. Townley, who is not even on speaking terms with any of us! Is it any wonder that we are worried and suspicious?

Spicer, Minn. — The Cornfield Philosopher.

102

CHAPTER XI | ATTEND LEGISLATIVE SESSIONS

Beginning as far back as 1882 I have attended some eighteen or twenty legislative sessions in the capacity of a reporter in the state of Iowa, Nebraska and Minnesota.

In practically all of these sessions “big business” was on the job from start to finish. It wanted the speakership of the House and the control of the leading committees by its “friends.” If it did not get them it put up a fight, generally disguising the real issue.

It may be truly said that in nearly every district what is termed “the special interests” had candidates for both the Senate and the House. The “interests” include the railroads,

Library of Congress

stock insurance companies, money lenders and private corporations engaged in public enterprises. To protect these special privileged interests and give them what legislation they wished, and prevent the enactment of laws to guard the rights of the common people in relation to them, appeared to be the main objects of the men running for the Legislature with the backing and support of “big business.” As they were led by able leaders, and thoroughly organized, and generally had the support of the press, it goes without saying that they usually won out. I wish to observe right here that good legislation—that is legislation in the interest of the masses—is always the result of agitation. When a Legislature moves on in “the even tenor of its way,” with little or no excitement or discussion, you may 103 depend upon it that the privileged few are having things all their own way.

The most potent forces I have found operating for good government are the organized farmers, and the organized working people in general.

By “good government,” of course, I mean government in the interest of the masses—of the common people.

When these elements were inactive the greedy corporations held sway and “special privilege” was in the saddle. In Iowa the Farmers' Alliance was potent force in politics from 1886 to 1894, and in the legislative sessions that intervened many reform laws were enacted to curb the influence and power of corporations—notably insurance companies and railroads.

It goes without saying that in my long experience I have seen many vicious as well as some good bills enacted into laws.

The Worst Bill

In my humble view the very worst measure I ever saw passed was put through the Minnesota Legislature in 1921. It is known as the Brooks-Coleman Act, and it transferred

Library of Congress

the control of the street railways of the Twin Cities and Duluth from the municipalities themselves to that of the State Board of Railroad and Warehouse Commissioners. This board consists of three members. I was unable to see any redeeming feature in this measure. It was vicious from start to finish from a public viewpoint.

But it had the backing of powerful interests, and was supported by some of the ablest men in the Legislature. It was no secret that the street railway people were back of the measure. The street railroads in these cities were 104 operating under contracts between the companies that owned them and the city authorities. The fare was restricted to 5 cents, even between St. Paul and Minneapolis. The story of how this act was put through, if all the details were given, would fill a whole volume and be mighty interesting reading. It ought to be given to the public, but a younger man than I am must undertake the job if it is ever done.

The skill by which this act, so vitally affecting the three most important cities, was piloted through the Legislature, especially the Lower House, excites my admiration.

When I first sounded the members on the question a decided majority were against the measure. But the lobby had not yet got in its most effective work. Some twenty-two members, who on my first interview expressed themselves as opposed to this bill, on final roll call were "lined up" in its support. I am sorely tempted to give their names. But their constituents have taken care of nearly all of them by leaving them at home.

A Narrow Escape

The bill while pending in the House had one very narrow escape.

Mr. Bernard, of Duluth, moved an amendment providing that the act must be first ratified by a vote of the people affected before it could be put in operation. Its friends admitted that the adoption of this amendment would kill the bill stone dead. A half-dozen members who had promised to vote "aye" on final passage could not be induced to vote against this

Library of Congress

amendment. But to the astonishment of everybody, except possibly a few on the inside, Mr. Melbye of Swift County and Mr. Putnam of Ottertail, 105 voted "no" on this amendment although they were opposed to the whole thing and recorded their votes against it on final passage.

Bernard lost out by just three votes, 64 to 61, so these two members had the credit of saving the measure, for with their support his amendment would have carried by just one majority. Although neither of them was able to explain to my satisfaction why they did not vote for this amendment and thereby take or use the most effective means of killing a bill to which they were opposed, yet I do not wish to cast any reflection on their honesty or integrity or even to hint at any improper motives.

It is said that against stupidity even the immoral gods are impotent.

The names of the House members who had the courage and the manhood to oppose this pernicious measure, and to record their votes against it on final passage, are here given. To resist the pressure, legitimate and otherwise, that was brought to bear upon them, required the most extraordinary courage.

The bill had 69 votes, 66 being a majority, while 57 recorded their votes on the negative. Their names are as follows: Anderson, Arens, Baxter, Bendixen, Bensen, Bernard, Burdorf, Carlson, Child, Cullum, Day, DeLury, Eastrom, Flahaven, Gartner, J.B. Gislason, C. M. Gislason, Goodwin, Hemstad, Hompe, Iverson, Jacobson of Rock, Keller, Kleffman, Kozlak, Lagersen, Lauderdale, Lennon, Lighter, Lockhart, Miner, Melbye, Moen, Nellerroe, Nelson, Nordlin, L. E. Olson, Lars Olson, Pedersen, Stahlke, Stein, Strand, Swanstrom, Sweitzer, C. J. Swenson., E. Swenson, Teigen, Tharkelson, Putnam, Sameck, 106 Scribner, Sluke, Spellbrink, Spindler, Walworth, Welch, and Wright.

Reader, look and see if your member's name is among these immortal fifty-seven. Remember it is the Legislature of 1921.

Library of Congress

The *Minnesota Daily Star* and the *St. Paul Daily News*, both of them leading state papers, declared that “improper means” had been used to influence the votes of members on this bill, and an investigation was threatened, but nothing came of it. The street railway people had very able readers, who both knew what they wanted and how to get the legislation they desired. As a rule ability wins.

Well, the change worked. Two of the three members of the board voted, among other concessions, to allow the street railway company to charge 7 cents instead of 5 cents for a single fare, and two fares instead of one between the Twin Cities, where hundreds and sometimes thousands pass daily. An honest court held the fare down to 6 cents, pending certain valuations, and there it is at this writing. A nickel was formerly the charge between Minneapolis and the State Fair Grounds. This year, for the same identical service, by virtue of the law, 12 cents was collected. This 7 cents additional taken in from many thousands represents one of the benefits the street railway people derived from the Brooks-Coleman Act, and one of the losses inflicted on the people at large whom necessity compelled to use the street cars. And yet they tell us people cannot get rich by legislation!

Kandiyohi County

While this book is intended for general circulation, to all parts of this as well as other states, I am going to devote 107 a brief chapter to this one county of Kandiyohi, in which for five years past I have had a summer residence, and which I call my home. This county lies about one hundred miles west of the Twin Cities. It is noted for many things, not the least of which is the superb and enterprising character of its inhabitants. It is a large county, having twenty-four full-sized townships.

Within its borders are more than two hundred lakes, large and small, abounding with fish and game. Two great state highways, No. 10 and No. 14, pass through this county, one of them from the Twin Cities to western points, the other forms a part of the route from

Library of Congress

all points in Western Iowa, Kansas, Nebraska and other southern states to the hunting and fishing grounds in Northern Minnesota and Canada. My humble home is on this line and in summer often more than one thousand cars daily pass my door. Green Lake, on which I live, is noted far and wide as one of the most beautiful lakes in the state, although not among the largest. Summer homes dot the shores of this fine body of water. On the northern side the Tepeetonka Hotel, capable of caring for nearly one hundred patrons at a time, is thronged with people all the season.

Not far away Mr. O. M. Hillman keeps the Old Mill Inn, where he has a shady spot on which he generously allows campers to set up their tents free of charge. The beautiful village of Spicer is located on the southeastern shore of this lake, and its enterprising and kindly disposed inhabitants vie with each other in making tourists feel entirely at home. It has two splendid up-to-date garages where all repairs to cars can be speedily made. Many of the citizens open their doors to travelers in the summer season at moderate cost for modern up-to-date rooms.

108

Nest Lake, nearby, is one of the best fishing lakes to be found anywhere. Then we have Diamond Lake, Eagle Lake, Foot Lake, the Kandiyohi Lakes, Solomon Lake and numerous others, the shores of which are dotted with pleasant summer homes. Come to Kandiyohi County and look around for yourselves if you wish to enjoy out-door life.

Came Near Having the Capital

Do you know that but for the veto of Gov. W. R. Marshall the state capitol buildings would be now located on the north shore of Little Kandiyohi Lake, not far from the center of this county? In 1869, the Legislature passed an act to this effect, but it failed to get the approval of Governor Marshall and lacked two votes of the necessary two-thirds in the Senate to pass it over the veto. No finer location for the state capital could possibly have been found. It was ideal.

Library of Congress

Willmar, the county seat, is pleasantly situated at the foot of a beautiful lake near the center of the county. It has about six thousand people, and is an important division station on the Great Northern Railway. There are other thriving villages in the county filled with enterprising inhabitants who have a glad hand and a welcome for the tourist and traveler. These include Kandiyohi, Atwater, Thorpe, Raymond, Pennock, New London, Georgeville and Hawick.

In the time of the great Indian outbreak in August, 1862, Kandiyohi County was unorganized and very sparsely settled. By great good fortune many of these settlers succeeded in escaping the fury of the savages, but in one settlement thirteen persons fell victims. Two Broberg and one Lundborg family were nearly annihilated.

109

The great bulk of the population is of Scandinavian ancestry and descent, but one township appropriately named Holland, is settled by settlers whose ancestors originally came from that country. There is also a good sprinkling of Scotch, Irish, German and native Americans scattered through the county in both the towns and the country.

Country Churches

The residents of Kandiyohi County are a God-fearing people, and every community has its church nearby. Country churches of almost every denomination abound, the Lutheran preponderating. Political speaking, Kandiyohi County has always been on the "Firing Line" in progressive movements. A history of these activities has no place in these columns for the author was not here and took no part in them until just recently. But I cannot refrain from saying just a few words along this line. At one time the Farmers' Alliance had twenty-two organizations in the county, one for nearly every township. Some of them had as many as eighty members. The educational work of these organizations along both co-operative and political lines had a lasting and far-reaching effect. Way back in 1876 old Peter Cooper, the greenbacker, got 100 votes, carrying Harrison Township by a vote

Library of Congress

of 38 for Hayes, 8 for Tilden to 51 for Cooper. Green Lake gave him 22 votes to 19 for Tilden and 30 for Hayes. As these two townships join each other, and cast nearly all the votes that were given to the veteran greenbacker, it is evident that the same party or influence was back of the movement. Just who or what this was the history of the county does not disclose. In 1880 the vote for Weaver, the anti-monopoly candidate, was only 16 in Harrison, but increased to 32 in Green Lake 110 and 150 in the county. In 1884 Ben Butler's vote for President was 231 and in 1892 Weaver's ran up to 933, Cleveland's was 424 and Harrison's 1,370.

Why So Hard to Organize

I have often been asked why is it so easy for other classes like lawyers, bankers and doctors of the same school to organize and work in harmony, and so difficult for farmers to do the same thing. I will briefly outline here a few of the reasons. Whole volumes might be written on the subject. First, it is much easier for individual members of any of the above-named classes or professions to see where their interests harmonize, than it is for the tillers of the soil. Second, the education of the farmer in the press and on the rostrum has been such as to discourage class organization. Third, intense local jealousy between farmers. Fourth, nationality and religious belief. I will enlarge upon these points a little.

All lawyers know that legal services can be charged for at a certain fixed rate, there being only a few in each community competent to render the service. Any attorney, for instance, would rather have a dollar than half of that sum for making out a certain paper. He is willing that his brother attorney may charge a dollar for this work since that is the only condition under which he can collect a like sum for a similar service.

The money-lender does not have to be told that the higher the rate of interest the larger his profits.

Doctors know that the charge of \$5 per call, or for a prescription, will bring them in a greater income than a charge of \$2 for the same service. Each naturally desires to succeed in his chosen calling.

111

But how about the farmer? Individually they would like to achieve success no doubt. In the past farmers have not been in the same financial condition. One man in a neighborhood would own his farm and have a snug sum in the bank to which he would add something every year. His wife and daughter would go in the best society in the vicinity. Another would be free from debt only. A third would have a big mortgage on his place on which by close economy he was barely able to pay the interest, while a fourth would be a renter, more or less beholden to the banker landlord. Roughly speaking, these are the four distinct elements it was necessary to unite into a harmonious whole in order to form a successful organization.

I remember once going into a community to start an Alliance where I met the following conditions. I first called upon the most successful farmer and had a long talk with him and his good wife. His profits had fallen off the previous season, and not wishing to draw on their bank account, the wife had to give up buying some new clothes she greatly desired and forego a contemplated visit to her relatives back East.

As I showed them that the object of the Alliance was to increase the income of the farmers both the man and his wife became enthusiastic promoters of the movement.

But it so happened that when the organization was effected the man carrying the big mortgage and the renter got the two principal offices. The woman's husband was ignored in the selection and their enthusiasm in the movement fell to zero. If this Alliance was to make some neighbor farmer more prominent they wanted nothing to do with it!

Library of Congress

About the hardest job I had in connection with farmers' 112 organizations was to keep down this jealousy. Farmers and workingmen have always been told by the politicians of both the old parties who wanted office that they literally lay awake nights studying how the condition of these classes might be improved. The either advised them to work a little harder and produce a little more in order to get a little more money, or if prices were very low, to grow less and not "glut the market" and thereby reduce the price.

Many a farmer has risen up in my meetings and asked this question: "If this organization is a good thing, why have no party leaders told us about it?" What answer could I give? One man was sure it was a democratic scheme to break up the republican party. Another was equally certain it was a republican plan to injure the democrats.

The farmers are a confiding class. They like to believe what they read and hear is true. No one can blame them for this for it is human nature. But there is a limit even to human credulity. The following story is told of a very credulous farmer we will call John.

In a nearby town there lived a fellow whom we will call Sam. Well, every time Sam would see John in town he would run up to him, slap him on the shoulder, ask him about his family, inquire about his crop prospects, and solemnly assure John that he had taken a great liking to him and was the very best friend he had in the world. These, among other things, is what he did to John to prove that friendship. In the first place he told a merchant not to trust him. When John learned of this he went to Sam and said, "You pretended to be my friend and I believed you, and yet Smith says you strongly advised him not to give any credit. How is that?" "Why, John, I did that 113 to prove my friendship. You have a pretty extravagant wife and daughter. They like nice things in the house and to wear. I feared that if given credit they would soon run up a great big bill you never could pay, for I know your financial condition, and then you would lose your reputation for straightforward honesty." John thought a moment and then accepted the explanation with a smile.

The next thing Sam did to him was to “black ball” him in a lodge he wished to join. When John found this out he asked an explanation, which was speedily forthcoming. Said Sam: “John, you are a bully good fellow, but you have one fault we must guard against. You will take a ‘nip’ when you get the chance. Now, in the back room of our lodge we keep all kinds of fine wines and liquors, and they are free to members. I feared if we let you into the lodge that you could not restrain your appetite but would ‘tee up’ to the limit and go home in the early hours of the morning in a badly demoralized condition. You know what temperance cranks your women folks are, and then what would have happened?” John reached out his hand to Sam and replied: “Now I really do believe you are my very best friend.” A short time afterward Sam objected to John's joining a local church and kept him out. In explaining this action he told John that he knew he was “mighty hard up,” and he feared that if he permitted him to unite with the church he would become so enthusiastic and so zealous he would pay so much for the preacher's support that he would impoverish his own family. John was a little dubious here, but he finally accepted the explanation and let things run on as before. Sam ended up his remarkable exhibition of friendship by running off with the farmer's wife.

114

When the sheriff brought them back, calling to mind how easily he had pulled the wool over John's eyes in the other cases, Sam ran up to John with both hands extended and said: “Don't think hard of me, John. I just did this to prove my good feelings toward you. I made up my mind that you are entirely too good a man to live with such a darn mean woman!” But John truly loved his wife and his credulity found an ending at this point and Sam went to the pen.

The old party politicians and congressmen succeeded in explaining their peculiar conduct towards the farmers in matters of legislation until they passed the Cummins-Esch Railroad Act, so called. This law requires freight rates and passenger fares to be placed so high that the income will cover all the expenses of operating the railways, including the salaries

Library of Congress

of the high officials fixed by themselves, and leave a margin of at least 6 per cent on what they think their lines are worth. This law is the straw that has broken the camel's back.

It is wholly indefensible before any intelligent audience. Of course it has some good features, but they are totally eclipsed by its bad provisions like "Section 15a."

This act of Congress directed and required the National Board of Railway Commissioners to fix rates so high on both freight and passenger business that the gross income would not only cover the operating expenditures fixed by the railroad managers themselves, including their own salaries, but insure at least 6 per cent interest on the value of the poorest managed railroad in the country. My farmer reader, how would you like to have Congress appoint a commission to fix prices for farm products so high as to cover your own wages and that of members of your family, 115 with no restriction on the amount of help you may employ, and thus insure at least 6 per cent on the poorest managed farm in the nation. To be sure there is a provision in the act requiring the roads that make over 6 per cent to turn back to the Government one-half of this excess for the benefit of the weaker lines, but so far as I know not a single railroad company has complied with this section, and there does not seem to be either power or disposition in the board to compel any of them to do so.

116

CHAPTER XII SOME LEGISLATIVE HISTORY THE LEGISLATURE OF 1913

The Legislature elected in 1912, on the crest of the great political upheaval that characterized the political campaign of that year, was truly progressive.

Governor Burnquist presided over the Senate.

In the House, Henry Rines of Mora, a progressive, defied the political bosses and won out in his fight for the speakership.

Library of Congress

They got back at him, however, in 1914, and defeated him for state auditor.

One of the best pieces of legislation enacted by the 1913 Legislature was the non-partisan election law which provided that all county officials, both houses of the Legislature and the judges of the Supreme Court should be chosen on non-partisan tickets. Just why the governor and all state officials were not included it is hard to determine. Of course the people could not take full advantage of all the provisions of this act at once and a lot of old party standbys succeeded in breaking into the Senate in 1915.

The Corrupt Practices Act was also placed on the statute books by this Legislature, which marked the beginning and the end of the use of money to control elections and of the work of the party boss and ward heeler.

The Speakership in 1916

When the result of the election in 1916 was made known in respect to the members of the Lower House of 117 the Legislature a lot of smooth politicians immediately got busy.

Minneapolis had chosen some very bright and able men largely on the "dry" issue. One of these, Mr. Asher Howard, is said to be a member of the chamber of commerce. He had two able lieutenants, Mr. W. I. Norton and W. I. Nolan, both with former legislative experience. Mr. Nolan himself entered the race for the speakership. Many other candidates bobbed up and on the surface it seemed to be a free for all race. Among these candidates was a second-rate lawyer named Ralph J. Parker, living at Spring Valley in Fillmore County. Hon. C. H. Warner of Aitkin, was a candidate from the northern part of the state. From the Seventh District there was a clean, bright young newspaper editor named Theodore Christianson, living at Dawson in Lac Qui Parle County. A farmers' organization, the American Society of Equity, although not a politician entity, had formally endorsed Hon. Magnus Johnson of Meeker County one of the leading members for the speakership. The Ninth District members had a meeting and endorsed Hon. Jno. B. Hompe of Ottertail,

Library of Congress

a former populist, as its candidate. All of these had been members, and had made a record in previous Legislatures. Parker had voted for county option in 1915, but otherwise was not offensive.

Big business decided that it did not want Warner nor Christianson nor Johnson, and it was not afraid to Hompe.

The friends of Johnson, Christianson and Warner together made up a big majority of the members-elect. Suppose they should get together and make a deal and thus organize the Legislature without consulting big business. Perish the thought! This must be prevented at any cost. 118 Mr. Johnson was known as the farmer's candidate, and his hostility to the Minneapolis Chamber of Commerce was well known. Mr. Warner had voted for county option two years ago, but did not want to organize on a wet and dry issue. He had supported in a previous session the Cashman Distance Tariff Law to regulate freight rates and he was inclined to be progressive in his views on public questions. Moreover he had publicly stated that if chosen speaker he would appoint a majority of farmers on the important committee on grain and warehouses. Mr. Johnson wanted to fight it out on the floor of the House and for some days it looked as if this might be the outcome. Mr. Christianson was the dryest of the dries and could not well be deserted by the dry contingent from Minneapolis without some sort of an excuse.

Mr. Parker was a dry also, but, as the Irishman said, not a "bigoted one." For reasons best known to themselves the dry contingent from Minneapolis selected Mr. Parker as their candidate. "Barkis was willin," and more than willing, but how to switch over the dry and the progressive followers of other candidates to his support was the question. How could the farmer members be induced to support the candidate backed by the Minneapolis Board of Trade. A happy thought comes to the great triumvirate, Norton, Howard and Nolan.

Library of Congress

To this triumvirate may be added four of the smoothest politicians in Minnesota, but whom I will not dignify by naming here.

Thomas Frankson, who had formerly lived in Spring Valley, was well acquainted with Parker. Mr. Frankson had moved to St. Paul and became quite wealthy in the real estate business. He had entered the race in the republican 119 primaries for lieutenant governor. In this contest he had drawn around him the very able political chieftains in the state, including the four above referred to. Frankson, by the expenditure, as he himself admitted, of about \$30,000 had won the nomination which was equivalent to election and had no further immediate use for the machine he had built up. To transfer the power of this machine to the support of neighbor Parker was an easy matter. The various candidates for the speakership, except Warner and Johnson, were induced to agree to go into an eliminating convention. Each was to name a friend and these were to meet and consider the qualifications of the respective candidates and then make a selection by dropping the one who received the lowest number on each ballot. Ten candidates were represented, but it was agreed for some reason that I confess I do not fully understand that the successful man must have at least seven votes, although six would be a majority.

Mr. Nolan chose W. I. Norton for his representative.

Mr. Edward Indrehus, who had formerly worked in railroad shops, had developed a farm in Benton County and was serving his second or third term in the House. He is a shrewd political manipulator and is probably looking forward (vain hopes) to future political honors. Benton County is in the Sixth Congressional District and naturally as politics goes Indrehus should have supported Warner, but he did nothing of the kind. Then as a farmer and as a member of the same farmer's organization he should have favored Mr. Johnson. But instead of doing that he became a violent partisan of Mr. Parker's, although he knew or could have known that Parker was the candidate favored by the Minneapolis Board of Trade.

In this famous eliminating convention Theodore Christianson, who was head and shoulders above the other candidates in point of fitness and ability, was at first a prime favorite. He was loyally supported by Mr. Frye of Kandiyohi, Mr. Bernard of Duluth, and Mr. Sutherland of Martin. It was even reported that he was the personal choice of the entire ten eliminators, and yet he was not nominated.

At one time he mustered six of the necessary seven votes, but the strong opposition of Indrehus and Norton prevailed and Parker finally got the seven necessary votes and according to agreement eliminated the other opposing candidates save Johnson and Warner. Emboldened by this success the friends of Parker claimed everything, including the support of a large contingent who were absent, and had expressed no preference. Having eliminated the objectionable dry candidate, Mr. Christianson, no great difficulty was experienced in winning over enough of the wets, mainly from Ramsey County to insure Parker the nomination.

In this contest Mr. Warner had but half-hearted support from his own (the Sixth) Congressional District and from his neighbors in Northern Minnesota.

As already stated Mr. Indrehus was openly hostile. Mr. Pendergast of Beltrami was indifferent and stayed away. Mr. Dare of Cass was sick. Messrs. Brown and Bouck of Morrison were standpatters and moreover had a candidate of their own for another position. The three members from Stearns were new members and more or less under the influence of Mr. Indrehus. Mr. Orr of Wadena was not only a standpatter, but had a contest for his seat. Mr. Mossman of Todd, a new member, although a farmer was a 121 conservative. Mr. H. A. Swanson of Crow Wing was serving his first term.

Mr. E. R. Hinds, a veteran politician of Hubbard County, was the only efficient worker for Mr. Warner of the whole baker's dozen of the Sixth District members. He had joined the Flowers combine two years ago and tried hard to get help from friends of Mr. Flowers,

Library of Congress

but Oscar Swenson of Nicollet, a farmer who had held aloof from Mr. Johnson, hoping it was said that lightning might strike in his direction, surely a vain hope, was holding or trying to hold the Third District out of the contest for his personal advantage. Had Swenson and Indrehus been true to the farmers' organization to which they belonged, and had they loyally supported its candidate, it is the opinion of the writer that Mr. Parker could never have won the speakership.

A majority having "signed up" to support Parker, Warner and Johnson gracefully surrendered. But Ralph Crane never lowered his flag. He was a near neighbor of Mr. Parker, living just across the line in Mower County and on the roll call refused to vote for speaker, in order, as he intimated, to maintain his own self-respect. All honor to Mr. Crane.

Speaker Parker tried hard to please everybody, commencing with his friends on the eliminating committee and the candidates they had eliminated. Of the powerful committee of seven on rules, which by the way must approve every appointee of the speaker and can discharge any employe of the House at any time, and whose actions could be overruled only by a three-fourths vote of the members, Mr. W. I. Nolan of Minneapolis was made chairman, as might have been expected, Mr. Indrehus and Mr. Swenson 122 were also rewarded by a membership on this important committee, Mr. Claude Southwick of Wells, Faribault County, a prominent standpatter, who had fancied that he was in the race for speaker, and Mr. Larson of Pine, a radical dry who had gone over to Parker, were also placed on this committee. The sixth was Mr. Charles Murphy, a country members from the Duluth District who had been instrumental in swinging the entire Eighth District, save only Bernard and Searles of Carlton, from Warner over to Parker. Mr. Murphy was further honored by being made chairman of the important committee on public domain, when most of the public lands were located in St. Louis County or nearby.

The seventh member of the rules committee was Nels T. Moen of Ottertail, who was supposed to represent Mr. Hompe, but who never presented his name for consideration, and who speedily joined Indrehus, Norton and Larson in urging the claims of Mr. Parker.

Library of Congress

Thus three of the members of this all-powerful committee were eliminators who eliminated the other fellows and the three others were alleged or actual candidates who were thrust aside.

Mr. Sutherland of Martin was made chairman of the committee on temperance and the dries given nine members to six for the wets. Manus Johnson was made chairman of the grain and warehouse committee and the farmers given a small majority to contest with the fighters for the other side like Howard of Hennepin and Pittenger of Duluth. Oscar Arneson, was elected chief clerk of the House after some protest on the part of the Ramsey County delegation and his brother, J. M. Arneson, was appointed speaker's clerk, both at a salary of \$10 per day.

123

TAXATION

As the farmers' organization have taken up the subject for a comprehensive study, and the next Legislature is certain to deal with the matter, the question of taxation has become a live issue.

The writer, although not a large taxpayer, has given considerable study to the subject in recent years.

In considering the matter there are some general principles that should be first settled. Let the question be asked: "Who ought to pay the taxes?" What should be the answer? This question has been answered indirectly in various ways. All forms of tariff taxation, save only in exceptional cases, is a tax on consumption, but as this form is prohibited to the states it may be omitted here.

The two others are a head or poll tax and some form of property tax. In some states the poll tax furnishes considerable income, especially for road purposes, to which it is generally applied. Sometimes it is "worked out." Three days' labor on the public highway,

Library of Congress

under the direction of a road overseer or supervisor, being required of every male inhabitant between the ages of twenty-one and forty-five.

This system has never been very popular and in some states has been entirely discarded.

There are three forms of property tax so to speak.

1. A direct assessment at some fixed rate on all property listed by the assessor, with certain exemptions fixed by law.
2. An income tax.
3. An inheritance tax.

124

The first form is as "old as the hills," while the last two have come into operation in recent years.

There are, I might add, certain forms of special tax, like the automobile tax, and a tax on gross earnings, like the railroad tax, which will be considered later.

It costs a "pretty penny" to run the state of Minnesota, with its 2,225,000 population, in all its varied activities for a single year. The regular taxes collected in the eighty-six counties in 1916 amounted to over \$56,000,000. Of this vast sum the 45,000,000 acres of land (exclusive of town lots) assessed at \$931,000,000, or an average of \$20.80 per acre, paid almost two-thirds. Town lots were assessed at \$436,000,000, and personal property (except money and credits) at \$212,000,000, and cash or its equivalent at \$224,000,000. As this class of property pays a special 3 mill tax, the revenue derived from this source amounted to about \$670,000.

Library of Congress

As the farmers and real estate owners pay all of the land tax the bulk of that on “personals,” and some of it at least on the “cash,” it will clearly be seen that the farmers pay almost, if not quite, two-thirds of all the direct taxes.

In addition to this the state itself collected in 1916 from special taxes on a list of things too long to enumerate here, and received from fines, royalties, interest, etc., about \$24,000,000, so that (including, of course, the support of the state university and the other state institutions) the state received and expended the sum of \$80,000,000 in a single year, or more than \$35 for every inhabitant.

It is not my purpose to take up and consider the relative cost of governing Minnesota, in comparison with that of other states, though that might prove interesting. I am chiefly concerned as to the source from which this vast revenue should come, and the form of collection and distribution.

The schools absorb just about one-fourth of the direct taxes, in addition to the aid received from the state. The township road and bridge fund runs up to about \$3,700,000, other township expenses, \$1,340,000. The cities and villages entail an expense in the aggregate of nearly \$11,000,000, almost as much as the schools. The counties spend more than \$15,000,000; while the state's share is a little less than \$11,000,000.

A Tax on Ore

If we go on the theory that “those should be the most heavily taxed who are best able to bear the burden, are the most prosperous, or have paid the least for their properties,” the ore lands offer an inviting field for taxation.

The state originally owned all of the ore beds located on the swamp, university, school, salt springs, or internal improvement land, which includes the most of them. Just how and

Library of Congress

why the legislature was induced to alienate these valuable possessions would make a "long story" that might reflect no credit on the present owners.

The lawmakers were in woeful ignorance of their great value, which may not have been true of the recipients of the bounty. The real value of the vast iron deposits in Minnesota is almost beyond computation. Already geological experts have discovered beds that contain almost one and a half billion tons of high-grade merchantable ore and an unknown and almost unlimited quantity of the second grade, which only needs to be treated to be made available.

126

The value of this ore in the ground, contingent of course upon its being brought to the surface and utilized, which in time will surely be done, is almost equal to all the other taxable property in Minnesota.

The state has leased school lands for mining purposes, on which is located about 150,000,000 tons, from which it gets a royalty, payable as it is mined, of 25 cents a ton, less than one-fourth of its value.

These ore lands are now taxed, that is, there is a pretense made of taxing them, but the total amount paid is just around \$8,000,000, so I am informed.

The ownership or control of these ore deposits is largely in the hands of the United States Steel Corporation, otherwise known as the Steel Trust, and allied interests. The ore lands are located in St. Louis, Itasca, and Crow Wing Counties, and the people in these counties would like to believe that the state has no right to tax them for state purposes. But this position is wholly untenable. The mineral wealth of Minnesota, no matter where located, for taxation purposes belongs equally to all the people.

The Tonnage Tax Bill, which passed the House and was “lobbied” to its death in the Senate, imposed a tax of only 2 per cent of its value at the mouth of the mine of all merchantable ore. This would have brought in a revenue of almost \$2,000,000 annually.

Tonnage Tax Up Again

It is morally certain that the people will not rest while they are groaning under a heavy burden of taxation, and the big steel interests escape with slight taxes. The Tonnage Tax will bob up again and is bound to be a leading issue in the election of the next Legislature.

127

If necessary this may be the only system adopted, a tonnage tax being in lieu of all other taxes.*

* Since the above was written a Tonnage Tax Law has been enacted.

As is well known the railroads made a strenuous fight against being taxed on a fair valuation of their property, and a compromise was finally effected by which a 3 per cent tax on the gross earnings was fixed. This per cent has been successively raised until it is now 5 per cent, and is susceptible of a still further increase.

The state of Minnesota collects a graduated inheritance tax which yields a considerable revenue. This could be greatly increased, especially on very large fortunes, and where other than very near relatives are the beneficiaries. Most of these fortunes anyway have come from the gift or sale at a nominal price of the state's lands, timber or minerals, and from favorable legislation and franchises.

A Cumbersome System

The system of taxation is expensive and cumbersome. It ought to be simplified. I do not see why the state could not be supported entirely by the special taxes, so-called, and leave a comfortable margin to be distributed among the schools.

Library of Congress

State taxes and county taxes being entirely separated, and each county being the unit, I believe that lower taxes would necessarily follow. At least the matter would be entirely in the hands of the people in every community. Local self-government has always appealed to me as right and proper.

Economy and Efficiency

Some have suggested that we also take up the matter of an economical administration of the state's affairs. But 128 there is great danger of undertaking too much at once. It is not the sure way to success. Let us first settle the question as to who shall bear the burdens of government, and eliminate the tax shirkers if there be any. Then, I have no doubt, the effort to bring a more efficient and economical government will have the active and cordial encouragement and support of our heaviest taxpayers and would therefore succeed.

Invisible Government

Here in Minnesota men running on party platforms containing distinct pledges of party policies have been elected to office presumably to carry out these politics. But as a matter of fact back of the party politician stands the representative of the Invisible Government, otherwise known as "big business." The attorneys and representatives of big business are in evidence in every political convention; they dictate party policies, write the platforms, tell the speakers what they shall say, and control the press to a large extent. They keep in their employ, or within easy call, a small army of the smoothest politicians, both men and women, the nation affords.

Were I to name the interests referred to I would mention; 1, the railroads. 2, the big milling interest. 3, the packing plants. 4, The Twin City Street Railway Company. 5, the lumber barons. 6, the Steel Trust (if there is such a thing). 7, the brewers, and lastly, certain big banks. Big business and politics are Siamese twins and cannot be separated. One of these interests often aids the other.

Library of Congress

Every effort on the part of the people to regular or to control, or in any way to interfere with the methods of 129 doing business of any of these big corporations, is strenuously resisted.

The work is done under cover, when possible, and as quietly as may be, so as not to attract attention.

The First Leasing Act

In 1889 the Legislature enacted a law providing for the leasing of ore lands by the state auditor, who is ex-officio land commissioner. The bill was introduced into the House by a man named Crossfield, and seems to have passed both branches of the Legislature by a unanimous vote. By the provisions of this act any one could get a lease on not exceeding 160 acres of state land, in any one lease, by the payment of a fee of \$25. The time limit was fifty years. However, the fee only carried the right to prospect for ore for one year. If ore should be discovered and mining operations commenced, a further fee of \$100 was required, and a royalty of 25 cents per long ton on 2,240 pounds was exacted on all ore taken away.

The lease also gave to the lessee the timber growing on the land for any purpose except fuel for smelting.

While the state was bound for the full term of fifty years, the lessee could terminate the lease on sixty days' notice. The lease contained a clause to the effect that within five years a railroad shall have been completed to within one mile of said land, that at least 5,000 tons of ore per year shall be mined, or at least a royalty paid on that amount, or \$1,250 per year. About six years later this act was repealed, but in the meantime more than one hundred leases had been made under which the Steel Trust (if there is such a thing) got possession of more than 160,000,000 tons of ore, now worth, when mined, fully 130 \$500,000,000, and the state will get for this common heritage of the people, in addition

Library of Congress

to whatever taxes it may collect, the sum of \$40,000,000. In 1889 iron was cheap, the cheapest it had ever been, and I suppose the august Legislators thought they were driving a hard bargain. However, no private owners of ore lands ever leased their mines for so small a royalty. The minimum was 60 cents per ton, and the maximum more than \$1.

The Lobby

What is popularly known as “the lobby” is composed of men (and women) who deem it their patriotic (?) duty to loiter around the halls of legislation and in convenient hotels during the session, cultivate the acquaintance of legislators, and instruct them how to vote on important bills. If a bill is a legalizing act, or relates to a matter of minor interest, the lawmaker is graciously left to grope in the dark,—and to vote as he pleases. But if the bill adversely affects the interests of some big corporation the festive and ubiquitous lobbyist is sure to be in evidence.

“You are Mr. Smith,” “yes.” Well, he has heard of you and desires to congratulate you on your election (he would have done the same thing for your competitor if he had won out). Hope you will make a great record. Visits your district sometimes. Knows some of your constituents, no doubt. Probably hands you a cigar and extends the glad hand. What is the ordinary country member going to do when an elegantly dressed, genteel man or woman greets him in this manner. Every day, perhaps, some similar scene is enacted. After a while there is a little bill he is interested in, or one if it becomes a law would be unfair to his friends, or do them injustice. Would you permit him 131 to tell why he favors or opposes the measure? Sure, you want all possible information on the subject. He proceeds and soon leads you to his way of thinking, and the deed is done.

This is the usual—the respectable way of the lobby, but it is by no means the only way. Results are what are aimed at, and the lobbyists live up to the theory or doctrine that the end justifies the means, provided the end is attained.

Library of Congress

The writer, who has spent eighteen eventful years attending sessions of legislatures, where important and far-reaching legislation was being enacted, and who has therefore had opportunity to learn something of the ways of the lobbyists, and of the tremendous pressure constantly exerted to lead lawmakers into by and forbidden paths, and to divert them from the lines marked out by honor and duty to their constituents, often marvels at the good results that sometimes follow. Surrounded on all sides as he is “by men on the make,” by those obsessed with an aching desire to get their fingers into the public treasury, with a thousand bills, many of them filled with jokers and wood chucks, to consider, the legislator who makes a passably good record, especially during his first term, deserves well of his constituency. Those lawmakers, either in Congress or in the State Legislature, men, for instance, like Joe Cannon of Illinois, who are standpatters by nature, and who vote steadily as big business may desire, are kept in office, as a rule, until they die of old age.

But those who are not the tools or slaves of “special interests,” generally find opposition even for the second term, and sooner or later are hounded out of political life, because and only because they have been faithful to their 132 oaths of office and proven their fidelity to the public interests. If you have a trained and efficient farmer legislator, keep him in the harness, promote him to a higher position when convenient, for you are thereby promoting the ends of good government.

I will add one suggestion that if carried out would tend to minimize the influence of the lobby.

The members now receive \$1,000 per session. The state might add \$500 to the salary of every legislator, who would take his wife with him to the capital city and keep house; then the wife herself should be given, say \$100 of pin money, provided she would keep a close tab on her husband and see that he stayed at home nights. She might go to the house

Library of Congress

every day and sit up in the gallery in plain sight of the proceedings. The lobbyists would then have but limited opportunity to get in their work.

I have no patent on this idea, and anyone is at liberty to enlarge upon it.

LINCOLN'S WARNING Regular Session Abraham Lincoln's Message to Congress, December 3, 1861. Listen

Monarchy itself is sometimes hinted at as a possible refuge from the power of the people. In my present position I could scarcely be justified were I to omit raising a warning voice against this approach of returning despotism.

It is not needed nor fitting here that a general argument should be made of popular institutions; but there is one point with its connections not so hackneyed as most others to which I ask a brief attention. It is the effort to place capital on an equal footing with, if not above, labor in the structure or government. It is assumed that labor is available only in connection with capital. That nobody labors unless somebody else, owning capital, by the use of it somehow induces him to labor. This assumed, it is next considered whether it is best that capital shall hire laborers, and thus induce them to work by their own consent, or buy them and drive to it without their consent. Having proceeded thus far it is naturally concluded that all laborers are either hired laborers, or what we call slaves. And further, it is assumed that whoever is once a hired laborer is fixed in that condition for life.

Now, there is no such relation between capital and labor as assumed. Nor is there any such a thing as a free man being fixed for life in a condition of a hired laborer.

Both of these assumptions are false and all inferences from them are groundless.

Labor is prior to and independent of capital. Capital is only the fruit of labor, and could never have existed if labor had not first existed. Labor is the superior of capital and deserves much the higher consideration. Capital has its rights which are as worthy of

Library of Congress

protection as any other rights. Nor is it denied that there is, and probably always will be, a relation between labor and capital producing mutual benefits. The error is in assuming that the whole labor of a community exists without that relation. A few men own capital, and that few avoid labor themselves, and with their capital hire or buy another few to labor for them.

A Brief Lesson in Political Economy

Experts tell us that we have five primary sources of wealth. These are the air, the water, the forests, the mines and the soil. But this natural wealth is of no real value itself until another factor is brought into use and that is labor. It takes labor to capture the birds in the air and to catch the fish in the sea. Forests are of no value until the trees are cut down and utilized. A mine must be developed. Land must be planted and cultivated. All of which require labor. The Lord Almighty created the raw materials, and the working people did the rest, and yet of all they have fashioned into use the great working class, which comprise 80 per cent of our population, have barely made a living. Just a lesson here from the 134 census. In 1890, 125,000 families, 1 per cent of the population, owned \$33,000,000,000, a little more than one-half of the entire wealth of the nation, then computed at \$65,000,000,000. There was a well-to-do class of 1,375,000 families, who held \$23,000,000,000 worth of property or \$16,000 to each family. Then a large middle class of 5,500,000, who owned in the aggregate \$8,000,000,000 of wealth, or \$1,500 to each family. Then an equal number designated as the poor class who possessed only \$800,000,000 in the aggregate, or \$150 to each family. Almost 40 per cent of the people living in a state of destitution and want.

Labor added \$40,000,000,000 more in the next ten years to this wealth, making the aggregate \$105,000,000,000, and since the total wealth of the nation has practically doubled, so have the fortunes of the favored few.

Library of Congress

The wealth of the nation at this date (1917) is estimated by the highest authorities at \$200,000,000,000, or three times as much as it was in 1890, of which 2 per cent of the people own \$120,000,000,000, 33 per cent own \$70,000,000,000, while the remaining 65 per cent, two-thirds of the people, approximately, have only \$10,000,000,000, 5 per cent of the wealth.

The burning question is, if these statements be true, how did such a small per cent of the people to get possession of such a large part of the wealth created by the labor of all?

Standpatism

A standpatter, or a reactionary, is a man who defends, or at least excuses, the methods by which the wealth of the nation has been transferred from the many to the few. He 135 believes that the so-called rights of property are paramount and superior to the rights of man. He thinks that the employing class should be permitted to prescribe all of the conditions under which men shall labor, grudging him (the working man) even the sacred constitutional right to quit work. If a lockout occurs, and hundreds of poor people are thereby reduced to the point of starvation, the capitalist owner of the plant is clearly within his rights, but if a strike takes place the employers are entirely at fault and should be kept off the streets, enjoined from even looking at or talking to the men who are called to take their places, and in extreme cases driven back into the factory at the point of the bayonet. He worships at the shrine of wealth, no matter how it may have been acquired. He believes that the Government, by legislation, should encourage "private enterprise." To transfer the property of the many to the use of the few by high tariffs and by subsidies is to him the acme of wise statesmanship. To vote away the lands, the forests and the mines belonging to all the people, as well as the valuable waterpower sites, to him is the principal work of Congress.

Library of Congress

To a standpatter, a conservationist of the Gifford Pinchot variety is a twin brother to an I. W. W., both of them standing in the way of progress and development, and both classes should be herded together and driven out of the country to the time of the Rogues' March.

Minnesota

We all ought to be proud of the fact that we are citizens of this glorious state.

We have a fertile soil, a wonderful climate, and a class 136 of the most happy, contented and virtuous people in all the world.

Our common school system, as well as our facilities for higher education, can scarcely be surpassed. Our great state university, with departments embracing and covering every avenue of human knowledge, has no superior, and scarcely a peer in all America.

Minnesota has cast party spirit to the winds and elects all of her county and minor officials, as well as the state legislators on no-partisan tickets, being almost if not the very first state in the Union to adopt this policy. Under this system there is no reason why we should not have the most economical and efficient government in the world.

Minnesota is a big state. It is over 400 miles from north to south, and its extreme breadth is 350 miles. It has nearly 80,000 square miles of land, and it's 10,000 lakes cover nearly 4,160 square miles. Of these, Red Lakes, in the north, are the largest. Leech Lake and the numerous other lakes in Cass County are annually visited by tourists from all over the country, and this is undoubtedly true of the many beautiful lakes scattered all over the state.

I do not wish to particularize, but there are no more beautiful bodies of water anywhere than Lake Shetek, in Murray County, or Lake Minnewaska, at Glenwood, in Pope County, or the lake at Detroit, in Becker County, or the many lakes in Kandiyohi County.

Library of Congress

A magnificent system of public highways, built partly by the state, and partly by the county and local enterprise, are being constructed in every section of the state, especially in the northern part.

Lake, Itasca, the source of the great Mississippi River, is in Clearwater County, in the north central section. This 137 lake is surrounded by a beautiful state park in which wild animals that used to roam the forests of Minnesota at will live and are protected. It is said that deer have become so tame that at times they will come up and almost eat out of your hand.

Fish are abundant in every lake and river, and the state is constantly restocking its waters, especially with the game varieties.

Taxation

Taxation is a subject that interests every one who owns property. A tax is a charge levied for the support of schools and to maintain government. The kinds of taxes that are or may be levied are as follows: 1, a head or per capita tax, sometimes called a poll tax, which in some states all able-bodied male citizens are required to pay. This is a very common tax in the south, where it is made a pre-requisite of voting. It varies in amount from 50 cents up to the equivalent of three days' labor. It is obvious that the most of this must be paid by the working people. 2, an internal revenue tax on whisky, tobacco, and when needed, numerous other things. This is a direct tax on consumption and about 80 per cent of it is paid by the workers. 3, a tariff on foreign products imported into this country. This tax is sometimes paid by the consumer and sometimes by the outside manufacturer, depending on conditions it would take too long to explain here. 4, direct taxes on property. This method is too well known to need explanation. 5, a tax on the gross earnings of semi-public corporations. Minnesota collects a 5 per cent tax on the total gross income derived from business within the state by her railroads in lieu of all other taxes. These taxes in 1916 amounted to the neat sum of \$5,480,000. 6, an inheritance tax. This is a certain per cent that property bequeathed by will to heirs or other beneficiaries is required to

Library of Congress

pay. 7, a graduated income tax. 8, a tax upon minerals in the ground and undeveloped. 9, a tax upon ore at the mouth of the mine, or so-called tonnage tax. 10, a special tax on automobiles and on stock insurance companies.

In considering methods of taxation, the first question to be considered is this: What class should pay the most of the taxes? A state can impose neither a tariff nor an internal revenue tax. Both of these are a direct tax on consumption, and are consequently borne by the common people to the extent of some 80 per cent.

The writer believes that the class should pay the most of the taxes that is best able to do so.

On this theory, or basis, an income tax, an inheritance tax, a tax on minerals, and a tonnage tax would be proper and just.

If I had the power I would make a radical revision of the entire system in vogue in Minnesota. In the first place, I would completely divorce the state from the county and other local taxes. I would make the county the unit for all farm and other ordinary property, and provide for a county assessor so that the assessed value throughout the entire county might be uniform.

I would invest the board of county commissioners with plenary powers in matters of taxation, so that any county that desired to try the so-called single tax would have the privilege of doing so; or if a county wished to exempt household goods, or farm improvements, or anything else for that matter, or to tax speculators' land or vacant 139 land owned by non-residents on a basis different from improved farms, it might have that privilege.

The State Constitution might have to be amended, but that could be done, or better still, a constitutional convention might be called, for the Constitution being more than fifty years

Library of Congress

old, is an out-of-date document anyway, wholly unfitted for the needs of these progressive times.

The other taxes noted above should all be paid into the state, and after all the state's expenses are met, and these should all be included in a budget, the balance should be prorated to the school districts on the basis of the school population.

I am confident if this plan should be fully developed and adopted that the per capita tax from ordinary sources, instead of being among the highest, would be the lowest in Minnesota of any state in the Union.

Socialism

I now approach a subject that I am aware I must handle very gingerly, since the average reader, owing to a systematic campaign of miseducation that has been carried on for a long time against the socialists by certain interests, is prejudiced.

I hold no brief for the socialist political part, and this booklet has not been written in its behalf, but I believe in fair play and, as the saying is, that * *Truth is Truth wherever found. Whether on Christian or heathen ground.

There are two, and only two, great systems or methods of doing business in this country. One of these we call competition, or the competitive principle, the other 140 co-operation, or the co-operative principle, which in the final analysis is a mild form of socialism.

When a man starts out in the business of buying or selling and pays no attention to what price another person engaged in the same line may ask or pay he is practicing competition. The best illustration of this is the case of the farmer who ordinarily does not ask nor know what even a brother farmer in the same township perhaps has received for identically the same kind of products. And I venture the assertion that there is more

competition among farmers today than among any other class, unless it be unskilled and unorganized working people in the sale of their labor power. There is no "Farmers' Trust."

As already stated every co-operative plan is a mild form of socialism. We have in this country three great institutions that are of a purely socialistic character. These are the public highways, the public schools, and the United States postoffice.

The highways are owned by the public, operated in the interests of all the people, and no one makes a profit out of them. The common schools are run on the same plan. The postoffice is today the greatest single business in all the world. We enjoy its benefits every day and yet it is conducted on a socialistic plan. It is owned by all of the people, and all have the right to use on exactly the same conditions, and it is not intended that the Government, that is, the people, should make any profit.

These three great institutions are not only socialistic, but they are the pure creatures of law, and could be abolished and destroyed by legislation. But it is safe to say that the most rabid hater of socialism would not consent to destroying any of these great institutions.

141

Competition in certain lines is impossible. For instance, the railroad is a natural monopoly. No competition is possible except at certain junction points. This fact has long since been recognized by the Government, and as a matter of fact competition in transportation among railways, except under certain conditions, has actually been made a criminal offense by law. For the Government to take over under its power of eminent domain all of the public utilities, including the railroads, telegraph, telephone, trolley and street car lines, would only be an extension of the postoffice department, and I have no doubt that this will be done in the near future.

142

CHAPTER XIII SOME ECONOMIC SUBJECTS—CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH— TAXATION CONCENTRATION OF WEALTH

Library of Congress

The census taken by the Government reveals an alarming condition of affairs. This census is taken by sworn officials every ten years, and a comparison of the statistics that are so carefully compiled each decade will disclose a tendency that must alarm any intelligent citizen who loves his country and its institutions. I allude to the tendency, very marked in recent years, of wealth to accumulate in the hands of the few. Roughly speaking, there are 100,000,000 people in the United States proper. The developed wealth of the nation is now estimated at \$200,000,000,000, and on this all authorities pretty well agree. This would be \$2,000 for each person, or approximately \$10,000 for every family, were it evenly divided. This is a visible capital in addition to all that is annually consumed or wasted. This wealth is distributed as follows: 2 per cent of the people—about 500,000 families—own or control 60 per cent of this wealth, or \$120,000,000,000. Thirty-three per cent own 35 per cent of the wealth, or just about their average; the remaining 65 per cent, or two-thirds of the people, own only 5 per cent of this wealth, nearly all of which they have created. Of the first 500,000 families about 4,000 of them own or control the bulk of the nation's resources.

Conceding these statements to be true, and they are 143 undisputed and indisputable, the question is, how has this condition of affairs been brought about, and in so short a time? John Jacob Astor is credited with being among the first of our millionaires. When he died in 1848 his wealth was estimated at \$20,000,000, which he accumulated in less than sixty years. At that time it was regarded as a very remarkable performance. Commencing shortly after Astor's death, and in about the same length of time, John D. Rockefeller has piled up a fortune, not of \$20,000,000, or even \$200,000,000, but a colossal fortune estimated by some as high as \$2,000,000,000! That is, Mr. Rockefeller "made money" the latter half of the century one hundred times as fast as the most successful financier was able to do during the first half.

Both men began as poor boys under the usual handicaps. Astor bought furs of the Indians, often as cheap as 10 cents of each, shipped them to London and sold them at a profit of 1,000 per cent. An ugly story has come down to us that Astor's agents furnished rum

Library of Congress

to the Indians, which was contrary to law, got them gloriously drunk and cheated them by wholesale. It is even said that Astor bribed public officers to wink at the practice. The money derived from the sale of these furs Mr. Astor judiciously invested in real estate on Manhattan Island in New York City. Much of this land was bought of the city, or of the public, Astor being able to convince the officials having the matter in charge that the land in question was of little or no value!

To those who may wish to inquire into the methods used by Rockefeller I commend a careful reading of "The Story of Standard Oil," written by Ida M. Tarbell, a book that may be found in almost any public library, or ordered from any bookseller. If further information should be desired a reading of the Congressional Investigation of the Colorado Fuel and Iron Company, in connection with the great Colorado strike of 1874, and the report of the 1915 committee on industrial relations, might prove interesting.

The greatest problem ever submitted to any people for solution is embraced in this question: "How may we prevent the rich man from becoming richer by making the poor man still poorer." No government in all the world's history has ever satisfactorily solved this problem. The worshipers of Mammon—the men who make money their God—in every country, by fitness, by sharp practices, by systematic deception, by a corruption of the press, and other disreputable methods, have heretofore invariably succeeded in exploiting the common people to such an extent that all wealth has been concentrated in the hands of the few. Statesman, indeed, in many nations of the past have endeavored to combat this tendency, but with only indifferent success. When Rome reached her lowest depth of degradation about six hundred families owned all her wealth. As a necessary consequence all of the rest of her people were dependent on these few for a living.

Daniel Webster said: "No republic can long endure where the tendency of wealth is to accumulate in the hands of the few."

All history verifies this statement.

CHAPTER XIV MY FINAL LECTURE

In 1923 I prepared and delivered the following lecture to the people of Kandiyohi County at numerous places—

Ladies and Gentlemen:

At the beginning of my talk I wish to make a confession—I never intended to be a farmer, and I will tell you why.

When I was a very small boy, living in Morrow County, Ohio, near where the late President Harding was born, I was working, one very hot day, alongside the roadside with a farmer cultivating corn. He plowed the corn with one horse, as was the custom in those days, going three times between each row. I followed with a hoe, thinning out the stalks where they were too thick, and destroying any weed that he missed.

As we neared the roadside a man wearing good clothes and riding in a top buggy stopped to exchange a few words with the farmer, who was also a preacher. Among other things I heard him say that he had some ice in the buggy, and although it was a hot day, he “felt very comfortable.” When he drove on I inquired who he was and was informed that he was the village doctor and was going out to see Mr. Smith who was sick. I saw this physician go by every day for a while. Shortly afterward, on an equally warm day, I saw another well-dressed man riding by in a carriage. On inquiry I learned that he was a lawyer going out to Farmer Smith's to draw up his will—a thing the preacher was kind enough to explain to me in detail. I saw the attorney going back the same afternoon.

In a week or so, not seeing the doctor going by any more, I asked why? I was told that Mr. Smith was dead. My inquisitive nature got the better of me at the point, and I wanted to

Library of Congress

know how much the physician got for waiting on him, and what the attorney received for his services. \$300 was the doctor's bill, and \$10 the lawyer's fee.

146

The man had told me he earned, he thought, about \$1 a day as a farmer. Taking this information as a guide I exclaimed: "Goodness gracious, was Smith sick a year?" "No," was the reply, "only about a month." Three hundred dollars for a month's attendance, that's \$10 per day; and the lawyer got at the rate of \$29 a day for his services! How could they get it? I was informed that it was all the result of their having acquired an education along professional lines.

"Me for an education I exclaimed. "You may bet I am not going to spend my life working out in the hot sun for a dollar a day as a farmer when by going to school and sticking to my lessons I can get in shape to earn \$10 per day as a doctor, or at the rate of \$20 a day as a lawyer." I decided then and there that some day I would be an attorney.

The farmer tried to discourage me. He thought I was cut out for just a plain, common farmer, and to get such ideas in my head would lead to dissatisfaction with my lot in life.

For fourteen long years I persevered in my efforts to fit myself for a lawyer, and when I thought I was in sight of the "promised land" a good doctor friend told me that I had broken down my health. If I opened up a law office I probably would furnish a job for the undertaker in about six months. He strongly advised me to take up an outdoor life that of farming. I tell you I was greatly disappointed and I admit I shed some tears. I had pictured in my mind how I would bring the great corporations to their knees in the courts and make them do justice to their working men and to the public at large. But in the end I decided that I would rather be a live farmer than a dead lawyer, so I went back to the farm and have been digging my living out of the soil to this blessed day. It is true I had opportunities to be what they call a gentleman farmer, and avoid the hard work and drudgery in a measure, but I did not take up with the offers. On the other hand, I resolved that I would

Library of Congress

use what education I had acquired, and what little natural ability I might possess, to promote the interests of my class—of the men and the women who till the soil for a living—and I have lived up to that resolution to this good hour. I used my evenings and part of the time rainy days and Sundays in making a comprehensive study of the life of the farmer.

I learned while in school that the professional classes were organized on class lines to advance and defend class interests. 147 These include the doctors of the same school, the lawyers, and the bankers, as well as many others.

Knowing this to be true the thought came to me with irresistible force: If these educated classes feel the necessity of organization along class lines, why should not the farmer do likewise? I soon reached the conclusion that organization among farmers was vitally necessary if they hoped or desired to be happy and prosperous. It was very easy for men to see that all who tilled the soil for a living had great interests in common. They had to eat and wear clothes and have a shelter, and they got their living from the same identical source—they dug it out of the soil. So I became an advocate and supporter of farm organizations.

I began indeed, in the days of the old Grange when I was a very young man. Today I am exceedingly proud of a remark I once made at a farmers' picnic in those early days. You know the Grange barred all religious and political discussions. Nevertheless I told them, though only a youth, that “some day the farmers would have to learn to cast their ballots to protect their right to their bread and butter—if they desired to continue to eat.” The last part of the sentence provoked roars of laughter. The older men shook their heads and feared I was going too far. For a mere boy to get up and tell old men that they couldn't leave everything to their “party,” but had to think and act for themselves, was mighty presumptuous.

The Farmers' Alliance, which followed the Grange, confessed that it had certain designs that could only be reached and carried out through political action in some manner. In

Library of Congress

1882 I, as the representative of *The Western Rural*, although but a farm hand, called the meeting and procured a place for holding the gathering of delegates from local Alliances that brought the State Alliance in Iowa into being. By the way, Milton George, the editor and proprietor of the above named agricultural paper, was the founder of the Farmers' Alliance. We made Jesse Kennedy of Ida County, president, and August Post of Moulton, Appanoose County, secretary. I was chosen as organizer and lecturer, a position I held many years.

Among the things I did way back forty years ago that I do not regret was assisting in the election of a common dirt farmer to Congress in the northeastern Iowa district, over a railroad attorney, one Tom Updegraph. The name of this farmer was 148 L. H. Weller, a shrewd, well-educated Yankee. Both in public and privately he acknowledged that it was the articles I wrote for the press that did the business.

The three parts into which the farmer's life naturally divides itself are producing, selling and buying. The plight the farmer has confessedly got into today is largely due to the fact that the agricultural class has given its almost exclusive attention to production—to this one problem—leaving the others to solve themselves. This class has been encouraged to produce more and more, and then take “market price” for its products—“market price” being what some one was willing to pay. Then the farmers would buy what they needed, paying what some one was willing to ask! Today government experts tell us—oh, they don't get on the housetops and proclaim it, but they put it in their reports—that on average the producer gets 37 cents of the consumer's dollar. In other words, we give almost two-thirds of what we grow to get the other third to market, and yet there are people wondering why farming is not a better paying business.

There are two methods, and only two, that I know of by which this could be changed. First, farmers might band together as some propose doing, ascertain the cost of production, add a fair profit, and hold the stuff until the price fixed is realized—until the demand became so great that the people would rather pay the farmer his price for his products than go

Library of Congress

hungry. The other method is for the people, through the Government, to get possession of all lines of transportation, carry farm products to the ultimate consumer at cost, the farmer, if necessary, disposing of his products through his own selling agencies. I confess I see great difficulties in the way of either method, but they are not insurmountable. Their very agitation will have a tendency to stiffen prices.

There can be no question but that the most of the things the farmer buys are purchased under the first of these systems. For instance, the maker of farm wagons figures out the cost of production, then he adds what he deems a fair profit. A big jobber will pay this price, perhaps, then add his profit, and sell to a wholesaler, who adding his profit, will supply the retail dealer, who will add what he thinks he ought to have, and the transportation charges, to what the wagon cost him, and the man who needs and must have the wagon comes along and pays the entire bill. Some years ago government experts reckoned that the cost 149 of the material and labor on a wagon made in a large factory was around \$17, but the wagon sold for \$85 in the retail market; and all that the men who received the difference between these figures—the \$68—could possibly do, was to transport the wagon from the factory to the local point where the farmer bought it, and find the ultimate buyer.

So the poor farmer has been getting the worst of the deal in buying and selling.

Let me put the matter of selling in another form. We sell less than 7 per cent of our products directly to the consumer, the balance, the other 93 per cent, must therefore be handled by so-called middleman. The principal middlemen are the railroads, the big packing plants, and the great flouring mills. It ought to be plain to everyone that the more the railways charge for the service they render, the less the shipper will have left of the proceeds of the sale, no matter what the consumer or buyer may pay.

The less the packer pays for fat stock, or the miller for grain, the greater his profits, regardless of what the consumer may have to give for meat or for flour or bread.

Now, they are all after the profits. That is what they are in business for. If anyone would claim that the railway company's were in the transportation business because the managers felt it to be their Christian duty to give the people cheap transportation, he would likely be sent off to some institution for the feeble-minded. If anybody would suggest that Armour or Swift bought fat hogs because they desired to create a market for the farmers' products, they would get laughed at by even the most credulous. If there was a person so foolish as to intimate that the system of grading grain was established for the purpose of enabling the big millers and elevator companies to pay higher prices to the grain growers, his friends would take him in hand as not being safe for him to run at large. Yet we have permitted a system of handling farm products to be built up under which we are compelled to employ middlemen in order to reach the market, and we must allow these parties to put their own value on the service they render the producer. This last statement explains why it takes about two-thirds of all we grow to get the balance to the ultimate consumer.

Well, our fathers realized the situation to some extent, and they went after the railroads, and after nearly a half century of agitation and fighting in the Legislatures and in Congress, brought

16. While much more might be written under this heading, 150 them under reasonable subjection, or were in a fair way to do so. But the world war came on and following it the railways had the so-called Cummins-Esch Act Passed by Congress, which among other things not only practically set aside state regulations, but actually required the Government to fix passenger fares and freight rates so high that the income of the railroads would cover all of their running expenses, including the high salaries of the big fellows fixed by themselves, and insure at least 6 per cent on the value of the property as ascertained by the Interstate Railway Commission, a body of men appointed by a government entirely friendly to the railroad interests.

The passage of this infamous act has made, or should make, the transportation question the one supreme political issue in this country with all producers who desire to live and

Library of Congress

prosper. Let me give you Henry Ford's experience in the transportation business right here. Mr. Ford bought a railroad some 400 miles long and put efficient managers at its head. He raised the wages of all the necessary help, making \$6 per day the minimum. He then asked the permission of the Government to cut his freight and passenger rates right in two in the middle, alleging that he only wanted a fair profit on the value of the property. Uncle Sam refused him permission to do this and only allowed him to make a 20 per cent reduction.

It has been stated that Ford says he makes 47 cents net profit on every dollar he takes in, when he only wants 4 cents, deeming that a fair rate of interest for the use of money on ordinary investments.

I wish to briefly discuss one further subject. That is:

The Concentration of Wealth

Experts tell us that less than 3 per cent of the people either own or control two-thirds of the wealth of this country. And, I will add, as a result of my own observations in a not very short life, that this small fraction of the population have more to do in shaping the politics of this nation than all the rest of us. As a political factor, money is all powerful, for through it we are able to control the sources of public opinion—the great newspapers and the most eloquent and powerful orators. And I will say, further, that this small fraction of the voters are in politics for every dollar they are worth, for the evident purpose of securing, largely by legislation, the balance of the country's wealth, and 151 what the labors of the working classes may continue to produce above the bare cost of living. This is the issue forced upon us by organized greed, which the Bible truly says is “the root of all evil.”

A few years ago the price of sugar, a necessity of life, based upon the cost of production and the law of supply and demand, was from 5 to 6 cents a pound. Suddenly, from no visible cause, the price was about doubled. The users of sugar, which includes everybody, paid the money. Who got it? A careful investigation would probably reveal the fact that a

Library of Congress

part of it went into the campaign fund of both the old political parties, and this may possibly be the reason why the sugar barons were not prosecuted under the Sherman Anti-Trust Act.

I am not making any charge. I am only hinting at a possibility. I know that somebody made bigger profits when sugar sold at 11 cents per pound than when it retailed at only 6 cents, and I'd like to know who they are and how they have been able to "work the trick." My curiosity on this point will probably never be satisfied.

When I went into this work I formed two resolutions that I have adhered to and never broken. I resolved that I would not be a candidate for any public office and that I would not accept any salary from the farmers. All the money I have received has been in the form of commissions, voluntary contributions, or collections, and altogether they have not covered my actual expenses. That is why I am so poor today. But I am not complaining. I feel that I have done my duty to my class and to the public at large. I have in press a book giving the story of my life in connection with farmers' movements and which I am selling for only \$1 per copy. Among other things it will contain the substance of this talk.

When the farmers in Iowa discovered that I was not in the agitation business either to make political capital or to draw a big, fat salary, they began to pay attention to what I was saying and writing, and as I only asked for one thing at a time and that seemed reasonable, I got their support. I remember one session of the Legislature we asked for just one thing and that was a law compelling "oleo" manufacturers to stamp the name on the package and not sell their product as choice dairy or prime creamery butter—and the law was passed. One session we asked for some insurance laws, at another for some railroad regulations.

152

It was formerly the custom to give all lawmakers as well as many other public officials free railroad passes. a most insidious and far-reaching form of political corruption. I feel proud

Library of Congress

of the fact that more than forty years ago, in a talk to a local Farmers' Alliance, I called attention to this great evil and commenced an agitation that finally resulted in outlawing the practice.

I am a part of the agitation which resulted in giving us free rural delivery of mail and finally the parcels post system, which is the greatest single business in all the world—things that can never be taken away from us.

I believe it is now our prime duty as voters to get behind a political party in the nation that will extend the parcels post idea until the system covers all shipments of every description, and gives us the service at cost. Then, through our own cooperative selling agencies, we can reach the best markets in the world, secure the profits that justly belong to us, and make agriculture the best paying business in this country instead of the poorest, as it confessedly is today. Don't you want to take a part in this movement and help bring about this result? Go home and talk this matter over with your wife and find out what she thinks about this plan of making farmers prosperous and happy.

No law is of any great value if its enforcement is in the hands of its enemies. Suppose we could force the old parties, rather than be driven out of power, to provide by law for the government ownership and operation of the railways. Putting the act into execution, being left to them, they would be sure to make a failure of it.

As I see it, we must create a party, and we have made a good start here in Minnesota, that will make this its chief objects: to give the people transportation at cost, and treat everybody alike as the postoffice does.

We must elect a Congress that will view with alarm the rapid increase of wealth in the hands of the few, and wisely legislate to arrest this tendency. A proper graduated income tax, strictly enforced, would be one of the most effective ways or means to do this.

Library of Congress

But first of all we must permit no more measures to become laws in the nation like the tariff bill, the Cummins-Esch Act to regulate the railways, of the proposed ship subsidy bill. That is why we have sent Shipstead and Johnson to the United States Senate and elected Kvale from this district to the Lower House. 153 We must let no more bills get by the State Legislature like the Brooks-Coleman Street Railway bill.

I do not wish to disguise the fact that we have a big job before us. More than a half century of class legislation has put things in a bad shape, and they are getting worse.

I must tell you a story here that fits the situation. A smart Yankee boy once left his home in Massachusetts to come West to seek his fortune. Arriving in Albany, New York, he sauntered down to the Hudson, where a number of small boys including the son of a rich aristocrat, were throwing stones out in the water to see how far each could throw. At length the rich man's son tossed a pebble farther than any of the others, and looking around in triumph, saw the Yankee lad standing there gazing on and said: "There, I've beat all these boys throwing stones and I can beat you, too." "I jest calkerlate ye can't," was the answer. "I jest bet I could throw you farther than ye flung that stone." The pampered son of aristocracy was furious at having his word challenged, and shouted: "What will you bet?" The youth from Yankeeland had a \$5 bill on a busted bank and put it up against a good bill produced by the other boy, and without more ado or ceremony he seized the little scion of wealth and tossed him out about ten feet into the cold river. The boy floundered around a while and finally got out and reached for the money. The Yankee boy pushed him back and exclaimed: "Not so fast, bub, you don't get the money yet. I didn't bet I could do this thing the fust time. I'm jest going to keep on till I do get you there," and he seized the shivering lad and tossed him out about twenty feet into the stream, saying: "Just be patient, boy, I gained ten feet that time, and I'll get there after a while." But the rich youth was nearly frozen and half drowned and willingly gave up the wager.

We may not get there the first time, but if we persevere we will surely win in the end.

Library of Congress

I regret that I must admit that the farmers in some other states are not as forward as we are here in Minnesota. They remind me of the story of the Irishman, Mike. Pat came over to his country and in a few years sent back for his brother. Mike arrived on a Saturday in June. On the next day the two brothers took a stroll along a small stream and on a sand bar they saw a big fat mud turtle. They say there are no turtles in Ireland. At least Mike had never seen one. It was a great curiosity to the newcomer. So he stepped upon its back to see what it would do. The turtle stretched out its long neck and Pat reached down with a sharp knife and cut its head off.

Now Mike was blissfully ignorant of the fact that this animal does not die the instant its head is severed from the body, so picked up the head to examine it further, when it gave a spasmodic gasp, and got him by the finger with a death grip. "Ow, Ow, Ow," yelled Mike. "Take him off, Pat. He's killing me." "You must be mistaken, Mike," replied his brother, "for how can the turtle bite when he is dead?" The answer was: "He may be dead, Pat, but he hasn't found it out yet!"

Our brother farmers in other states are as hard up as we are here, for the same causes are operating everywhere, but I fear some of them have not yet discovered the proper remedy for their condition. But they don't want to be like the boy's pups.

A certain lad, very fond of dogs, expected an increase in the dog family and was very much excited. He had never been informed that pups do not open their eyes till they are nine days old, and when they came he looked very much disappointed, but said nothing. On the fifth day he could stand it no longer, and not wishing to have blind dogs around, he took a hatchet and killed them. Observing that the eyes of some of them had opened he exclaimed: "Yes, you big fools, you can open your eyes, can't you, now that you're dead!"

We hope our brethren will wake up and open their eyes politically before they are entirely bankrupt.

A Few General Observations

All the real good we have got in this world, with rare exceptions, has come from agitation, so an agitator is not necessarily a bad fellow.

In the olden times a farmer who woke up to the fact that he was not getting a square deal was dubbed a calamity howler, and people were warned to keep away from him. Even to attend a meeting addressed by one of these agitators was regarded as almost as bad as running off with a neighbor's wife. But happily all this has changed. The "other fellow" comes to our meetings now and is even anxious to offer suggestions and devise plans as to how the condition of the farmer may be improved.

All this has come through our expressing our dissatisfaction at the polls. The eyes of the world are upon Minnesota since 1856 we elected one, Magnus Johnson, a common dirt farmer, to that august body, the United States Senate, last July by nearly 100,000 majority. And we will surprise them some more in the near future.

Now, we all desire to be happy and prosperous. If there is anyone in this house who does not have that wish in his heart let him hold up his hand. If any had done so, I would have strongly advised his friends to quietly send him away to some institution devoted to the care of the feeble-minded!

It is truly, "When poverty come in at the door, love flies out at the window."

We can largely remove this poverty and want by intelligent concerted action. First of all let us unite to secure to the farmer the legitimate profit in what he may produce. That can only be done by our getting control of the means of distribution, and making the farmer the "boss" instead of the mere "hired man" of big middlemen. This can only be effected through governmental agencies—if you please, through politics. So if you don't wish to be happy and prosperous, if you want the other fellow to have all the joys and pleasures of life, all you need to do is to stick to the policies championed by the old political parties

under which 3 per cent of the people have been enabled to gobble up or get control of two-thirds of the wealth of this republic, and unless these policies are speedily changed, are in a fair way to get the balance.

156

CHAPTER XV SOME JOKES

When I started in to obtain an education a professor in a lecture told us students that we could not have girls and books in our minds at the same time. "Books," said he, "never crowd out the girls, but thoughts of young women often crowd out thoughts of the lessons." So I resolved to "cut out" all social life at school and elsewhere.

It was my usual custom to take my books with me, say in corn husking time in the fall, and besides doing my work keep up with my classes by studying nights and Sundays.

In a certain neighborhood where I worked, the women observing that I paid no attention to the girls, got up the following story to explain why:

They said, when I was about sixteen I attended a literary performance at a country schoolhouse, and when it was over I stepped up to a little girl named Sallie, and whispered, "Sallie, would there be any harm in my walking along the road with you tonight?" She replied, "I guess not, Jimmie, my folks won't care if yours don't." So we walked to her home a half mile distant, I upon one side of the road, and she on the other.

When we reached the gate Sallie turned to me and said, "Jimmie, before you go I wish you would promise me one thing." "What is that," I asked. "I want you to promise me on your word and honor," she continued, "that you 157 will never tell a single soul that you beamed me home tonight." I replied, "You may bet I never will, Sallie, for I am just as much ashamed of it as you are!"

Library of Congress

They said I then dodged away in the darkness and could never muster up enough courage to ask a girl for her company afterward!

In another neighborhood the following explanation was given for the same peculiarity on my part: They said, when about sixteen, on a Sunday night I put on my best clothes and went over to a neighbor's where there was a sweet little fifteen-year-old damsel named Mary. The girl's mother, noting my shamed looks, called the little girl aside and told her I had come over to see her and she must entertain me in the parlor; that I might sit on one end of the lounge and she on the other. They said when I got seated in such close proximity to the adored one that I lost my tongue and was unable to utter a single word. Mary became weary of the long silence, and looking up at me rather sheepishly, said, "Jimmie, can't you say something?" After she had repeated the question at intervals several times I managed to ask, "What shall I say, Mary?" The girl hardly thought it her place to suggest the line of conversation, but my continued silence aroused in her a happy thought. She blushed and whispered, "Say something soft." To think of something of that nature called forth my best efforts, as I was very desirous of pleasing Mary. At length I was able to whisper, "Mashed potatoes!" She intuitively knew this was not a proper subject for young people to discuss on such occasions, and not wishing to laugh in my face, ran out into the room where her mamma was, leaving me alone. I feared I had offended her, and making a spring through the front door, ran all the way home, and had never had spunk enough to go and see a girl since.

I had to accept these explanations of my conduct wherever I went, and grin and bear the fun that was poked at me.

One Joke That Didn't Work

There was a trick that a lot of farmers tried to play on me that didn't work out as planned. During the holiday vacation, or after I was through husking corn for the season, till school opened again, I would solicit subscriptions for a farmers' paper to secure some premium

Library of Congress

that was offered. One of the premiums thus obtained for a couple of months' effort I sold for \$150 in cash. In a certain community there lived a close, crusty old farmer with an equally stingy wife, who hated all agents, and either set the dog on them or drove them off the place with a club, sometimes using his boot.

I happened to meet a number of men at a country store and solicited their subscriptions. They sent me to this party, agreeing that if he took the paper they would. Of course, they expected that I, being rather persistent, would get booted off the place, and they would have the laugh on the fresh college student. The man was finishing his corn husking with one hired man and only one wagon.

They took five rows the field and back again for a load. The sun was about a half hour high, and they had the five rows to husk clear across the field again in order to get their second load, and the old man was badly out of humor when I jumped over the fence and asked him to subscribe for the paper.

"Don't want it," he replied. "Know more than the 159 editor does about farming now. You lazy scalawag," he continued, "you had better be at work—better be husking corn than running around git'en folks hard earned money for worthless papers." A thought came to me that was an inspiration. "Well, I can husk corn," I replied. "I believe I can beat you, too. I'll tell you what I'll do. I will husk two rows across the field and keep ahead of you if you will take this paper. If I don't keep ahead I will do it for nothing." This happened to be the old man's weakness. As a cornhusker he thought he was unbeatable. So he said, "I will do it," thinking only of my free help to get the load out.

He sprang to the right side of the wagon, thinking to make me throw crosshanded, but fortunately I am a left-handed husker. Well, the way that old codger worked to save his \$1.50 was a caution, but every time he came near me I'd hit him on the head with an ear of corn. He would rub his head and go and pick up the ear, meanwhile I'd husk two or three hills. The hired man averred that he counted fifteen times that I hit him while crossing the

Library of Congress

field. By this scheme I kept ahead of him all the way, and he owned up that he was beat. But he had to go to the house for the money so I went along. I busied myself scooping out the corn while he was gone after the pocketbook. Soon I heard a shrill woman's voice exclaim: "Want the pocketbook! What can you want of it this time of night?" He evidently told her for she continued, "You old fool, you, you need a guardian, squandering our hard earned money on a worthless newspaper, I've a notion to not let you have it." However, he got it, came out and gave me the money, and as I was still scooping away invited 160 me to stop all night. When I went in the woman looked like a thundercloud and never spoke to me.

Well, the fifteen men who had no thought of my being able to secure the subscription, who had promised to subscribe if I did, felt the joke was on them, but I believe they all kept their word. But everybody who heard of the deal had a laugh, and stock in the boy who was working his way through college rose above par.

The Farmer Who Hadn't Time

One day in the month of October, while traveling in Missouri during a cold snap, I observed a farmer out at a woodpile making heroic efforts to cut some very hard dry wood with an old dull meat axe.

I stopped and said, "Why don't you grind your axe. I hate to see you waste your energy that way, besides your children may freeze. I'll turn the grindstone myself if you will." Between the strokes he replied, "Much obleged to ye, stranger, but I jest ain't got time. I kaint hardly keep the fires goin' now.

So he kept on with old meat axe, wasting his strength and energy, while if he had only taken the time to properly sharpen the tool he was using he could have accomplished the work much more easily and effectively.

Many farmers have followed the same short-sighted methods. They give all their thought and energy to production, leaving interested middlemen to fix the prices!

161

CHAPTER XVI SOME PROGRESSIVE I HAVE MET

Minnesota has always been on the front line in producing men who have championed the cause of agriculture.

O. H. Kelley, the founder of the Grange, was a resident of the state.

The fame of Ignatius Donnelly is world-wide.

Space will not permit my covering the old greenback or populist movement. I was not then a resident of the state. But I will name some men I have met who have helped and are helping to put Minnesota in the forefront of the battle for popular government.

Senator Henrik Shipstead

Senator Shipstead was just a common dentist in Glenwood, Pope County, but he had an inquiring turn of mind and a disposition to study political problems. The progressive of that county discovered him, took him up and sent him down to the Legislature, where he at once took a place in the front rank. The people all over the state took a liking to this stalwart friend of the common people, and sent him down to the Senate in place of Kellogg, nicknamed the "Trust Buster."

Magnus Johnson

This remarkable man was born in Sweden and came to America when twenty years of age. He never attended an English school, but he worked hard during the day and studied equally hard nights, and Sunday's, sometimes, until he had acquired a fair English education. He married a good wife and settled on a farm in Meeker County. He went into

Library of Congress

politics, was sent down to the Legislature five times with increasing majorities, and finally rewarded for his fidelity to the people's interests by being transferred to the United States Senate, a fit companions for Shipstead.

Hon. O. J. Kvale

Rev. O. J. Kvale, of Benson, a hard thinking Lutheran minister, following the Scriptural injunction: "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good," took up the study of "Townleyism" when the Non-Partisan League movement reached Swift County. He soon accepted its leading doctrines and, being a man of education and ability, and one in whom the people who knew him had supreme confidence, he was brought out for Congress against Volstead, who had supported the infamous Cummins-Esch Railroad Act, and defeated him by some 14,000 majority. A happy day will it be for this republic when more men of the character and standing of Mr. Kvale can be induced to enter public life.

Knud Wefald

I never met Mr. Wefald, who carried the northwestern part of the state in 1922 by a tremendous majority over Halvor Steeverson, and therefore cannot speak of his from personal knowledge.

Hon. Chas. E. Lindbergh

Among the pioneers in Congress, who never wore the corporation collar, or "took orders" from the big business 163 interests, Hon. Chas. A. Lindbergh of Little Falls holds a conspicuous position. For ten years he represented the Sixth District, defying all the powers of the plunderbund. However they got him at last. In 1918 he made a very creditable run for governor. He is extremely well equipped, both by education and experience, for any position of public trust.

Hon. A. C. Welch

Library of Congress

The Hon. A. C. Welch of Glencoe, McLeod County, for more than ten years a member of the Legislature, certainly deserves mention. He has worked hand in hand with Senator-Elect Magnus Johnson for legislation to aid the farmers. He is loved and trusted by the organized farmers of this state as are few other men. Wherever he may be placed "honest Anthony Welch" will make good in the public interests.

SOME EDITORS I HAVE MET James M. Pierce

Among the reformers and editors I have met in the West, who have made history and been persistent and conspicuous in their devotion to the agricultural interests, I would place James M. Pierce of Iowa at the head. Mr. Pierce was a fearless man. He founded and built up that great agricultural paper, *The Iowa Homestead*, of Des Moines, and made this paper the acknowledged leader of all the publications in this country devoted to the farmers' cause. He has now passed away, but *The Homestead*, under the able management of his son, Dante M. Pierce, continues to hold the same proud position. When the 164 reader wishes to subscribe for a live agricultural paper he should not overlook the Pierce publications.

Harry N. Owen

The Farm Stock and Home, of Minneapolis, ably edited by Harry N. Owen, is easily the leader among Minnesota farm publications that "hew to the line." Mr. Owen's father, Sidney M. Owen, who founded this paper in the early days, was in the forefront of the anti-monopoly battle, and at one time led the reform forces in a contest for the governorship. Mr. Owen aims to conduct his paper on the same line as did his father.

Victor E. Lawson

Victor E. Lawson, editor of that sterling publication, *The Willmar Tribune*, although comparatively a young man, is a veteran in the cause. He began his editorial career when barely eighteen years of age by taking control of the *New London Times*. At first he was

Library of Congress

a straight-laced republican party man, but was both a reader and a thinker and withal intensely patriotic. Believing in the Scriptural doctrine: "Prove all things and hold fast that which is good," he began to investigate political conditions, and soon became convinced that the old populists had a just cause for their discontent. For a quarter of a century past he has had the management of *The Willmar Tribune*, and he has made it the model local paper of the Northwest. At the present writing Mr. Lawson is prominently mentioned as likely to be the candidate of the progressive forces for the office of governor at the next election.

165

O. M. Thomason

The city of Benson and county of Swift have a splendid local paper, *The News* ably edited by a man probably as widely known as any writer in the reform movement in Minnesota, although still a young man.

Mr. Thomason, otherwise "Ripp, the Reporter," describes himself in his own inimitable style as follows:

"It was my good fortune to have been born in 'lapland'—that is right where Missouri 'laps' over into Arkansas, or Arkansas 'laps' over into Missouri, I never learned which. But at any rate, it was very near the line, in Taney County, Missouri, just at the foot of the Ozarks, near the famous White River, on Turkey Creek, in a little log cabin—just the same as Abe Lincoln.

"As to *when* I became a nut, that is hard to say. I think I was born that way. But my violent activities along rebellious lines actually began when Coxey's army marched to Washington—I wanted to go, but decided to stick to my job of \$10 per month, board and washing.

Library of Congress

"During the past twenty years I have Scouted over every state west of the Mississippi, from Old Mexico to Nome, Alaska, always 'sniping' on the firing line and finally settled down here to rest, read, fish, hunt, play golf, and watch the 'passing show,' two years ago."

F. A. Scherf

Mr. Scherf is a native of Hay Creek Township, Goodhue County, Minnesota. As a mere lad he took an active interest in the Farmers' Alliance. The people sent him to the Legislature one session. His great ability in the newspaper line has made *The Red Wing Organized Farmer* one of the leading progressive newspaper of the state.

166

William Mahoney

Organized labor is very strong in the city of St. Paul, and this is very largely due to William Mahoney, the talented and discreet editor of the *Union Advocate*, their organ. Mr. Mahoney is a born diplomat and by his wise and able leadership is making the confederated trades unions a tower of strength and a potent force in promoting the interests of labor.

J. L. Baldus

The farmers and working people of McLeod County owe their prominence in the reform work very largely to Joe Baldus, who for some years has been editor and manager of *The Glencoe Republic*. This is a model country paper in many respects, and reaches the home of nearly all leading farmers in that section of the state.

Fay Cravens

Mile Lac County has definitely taken her stand with the reform forces in spite of the influence and opposition of the big lumber interests of that section. This is mainly due to

Library of Congress

the work of Fay Cravens and his paper, *The Milaca Times*. Mr. Cravens wields a facile pen and his "Hit and Miss" column is very widely read.

P. J. Gleason

The progressive people of Repville County once had a leading reform paper, but extravagant management nearly wrecked it. In the hour its direct need P. J. Gleason, a country boy, came forward and assumed the management, and aided by the noble and devoted women of that section, is fast putting the paper on its feet in every way.

167

Ole Levang

Levang's Weekly, of Lanesboro, Fillmore County, has long held a conspicuous position among the papers of Minnesota not controlled or even influenced by what "Teddy" Roosevelt called "the powers that prey," and "the predatory interests." Mr. Levang's rugged and fearless honesty is certainly commendable, and his paper fully deserves the wide patronage it is receiving.

Other Reform Papers

This list covers only a few of the editors of the progressive papers, but includes all with whom I have sufficient personal acquaintance to speak of in a definite way.

The list below given is by no means complete, but it includes those which I can recall to mind at this writing. I can give only the names and addresses, but if the reader resides in the vicinity of the place of publication of any of them, or desires any information concerning the vicinity in which any one of them is issued, he should use this knowledge.

The Meeker County News, Litchfield.

The Wright County Press, Buffalo.

Library of Congress

The Free Press, Fergus Falls, Ottertail County.

The P. R. Echo, Alexandria, Douglas County.

The Leader, Lake City, Wabasha County.

The Norman County Post, Ada, Norman County.

The Rural News, Madelia, Watonwan County.

The Press, Cambridge, Isanti County.

The Forum, Mora, Kanabee County.

The Press, Canby, Yellow Medicine County.

The Farmers' Independent, Bagley, Clearwater County.

The Northern Light, Lamberton, Redwood County.

The Washington County Post, Stillwater.

The Union News, Mankato.

168

The People's Weekly, Jordan, Scott County.

The Tribune, Glenwood, Pope County.

The People's Press, Hallock, Kittson County.

The Post, Ashby, Grant County.

Library of Congress

And there are many others of this class whose names and location I cannot at this moment call to mind. All of which are worthy of support.

The Minnesota Daily Star

In my opinion the greatest work so far accomplished by the farmers and organized working people of this state is the establishing of that great paper, *The Daily Star*. More than \$250,000 was raised by popular subscription, that is, by the sale of stock, to erect a building and to equip it for the publication of a great daily paper to be controlled by its owners. The progressives, and those who wish to get the unbiased facts in regard to public matters, are giving *The Daily Star* their patronage and support, and it is fast becoming recognized as the leading daily of the state. It is now an afternoon paper, but a morning edition in the near future is among the probabilities.

The paper is at present under the management of Thos. Van Lear, who was at one time chosen mayor of Minneapolis by the progressive element.

An able and efficient corps of editors and reporters are employed by *The Star* and few public matters escape their vigilance. If you wish to get the facts, give this great paper your patronage.

The Women's Clubs.

Notwithstanding their many household duties the farm women, God bless them, in many parts of the state have banded together in clubs to do all in their power, acting in 169 concert, to bring about a better condition of things politically. This movement started almost simultaneously in different sections from a common impulse—the protection of the home.

In Isanti and Kanabee Counties Mrs. Minnie Cederholm Granby should have the main credit of doing the extensive work on this line wrought in that locality. She spent days,

Library of Congress

weeks, and even months, and largely at her own expense, going from house to house trying to enlist the interest of her sisters in the movement.

But it was in Renville Country where the cause found many devoted women, some in the towns, and many in the country, who were willing to go out as missionaries among their sisters to teach them the way to prosperity and happiness. For it is truly said, "When poverty comes in at the door, love flies out of the window." Nearly or quite every township in that big county soon had a live, flourishing club meeting regularly.

The farmers' local paper, becoming financially embarrassed, these enterprising and courageous women went to work with a will and soon had the neat sum of \$11,000 raised to put the paper on its feet. Miss Lily J. Anderson, of Franklin in this county, is the district organizer, and they are preparing to purchase an automobile for her use and put her to work on full time.

I would be pleased to publish a full list of the names of the noble women of this county who are making history so grandly, but I do not have them at hand. But I know Mrs. Hewerdine of Olivia, Mrs. Harold Baker of Renville, the wife of our district judge, Mrs. A. M. Anderson of Buffalo Lake, Mrs. Senator Schmechel of Morton, Mrs. Thorkelson of Danube, wife of the representative in the 170 Legislature, and Mrs. Geo. W. Richards of Boon Lake Township, who is a host in herself.

The clubs have a state organization, with Mrs. Cederholm, mentioned above, as state president, and Mrs. Susie Stageberg of Red Wing, secretary and lecturer. As the newly enfranchised women are going to ask for recognition at the next election, Mrs. Stageberg in being prominently mentioned as a candidate for the office of secretary of state, and she is well worthy the position.

This Seventh Congressional District, which largely through the efforts of the organized women, gave O. J. Kvale 14,000 majority at the last election, has an active local organization with Mrs. Baker, mentioned above, as president, Mrs. Flora Thomason of

Library of Congress

Benson, secretary, and Miss Lily J. Anderson of Franklin, organizer and lecturer. They propose to visit and thoroughly arouse the female voters in every precinct, hoping to double that majority a year hence.

A Final Word

I have often been asked if I do not regret my giving so much of my time to this free missionary work among farmers, to the neglect of my own private affairs, and to my writing hundreds and hundreds of newspaper articles for which I received no compensation, when by championing the “other side” I would have been richly paid for my efforts in cold, hard cash. I must answer no, I am not sorry. I devoutly believe that we live on this earth merely to prepare for a life in a better world to come. That it is our duty and our true mission to do all the good we can and as little evil as possible. I have stood unflinchingly by every reform or thing done for human betterment in 171 my lifetime. I have helped in the agitation that resulted in creating a public sentiment that forced conservative and reluctant legislative bodies to give us laws providing for a parcels post and the free delivery of mail to farmers, the regulation of railroads, providing for a graduated income tax, and other statutes of a similar character. For this work I have no apology to offer—none whatever. And when I stand at the Judgment Bar in the next world I hope they can say of me “he made the earth a little better by his having lived upon it.” That will be an ample reward for what I have tried to do.

The deplorable condition in which the farmer finds himself today is largely due to the fact that the men and women who till the soil for a living never studied politics from a class standpoint as others did. As an illustration: The men engaged in manufacturing, although not nearly as numerous as the farmers, unanimously demanded a protective tariff and they got it and by this means they prospered exceedingly.

The farmers permitted themselves to be “lined up” on one side or the other of the tariff issue, when what every man of them desired above all other things of a political nature,

was the active assistance of his Government in getting the products of his farm to the ultimate consumer in the best markets of the world at the lowest possible cost. By neglecting or overlooking this extremely important matter the farmers made it easy for a lot of enterprising fellows to get between them and their market and absorb the profits. It is estimated that only about one-third of what the final consumers pay for farm products ever reaches the pockets of the original producers. This of itself is a sufficient explanation of the hard times among farmers.

APPENDIX

175

PREFACE

This little booklet is not intended as a guide for highly organized bodies where a technical knowledge of Parliamentary Law is required. These "lessons," while designed only for the primary class, however cover much of the ground that must be passed over in acquiring a technical knowledge of the subject. A genius aspiring to a mastery of higher mathematics does not begin even so far over as "fractions"; on the contrary, he must commence at the beginning and learn how to enumerate, add, subtract, multiply, and divide, which are known as the "Fundamental Rules." So it is with Parliamentary Law and Practice.

It has been the aim of the writer in preparing this booklet to make the first principles of Parliamentary Law so plain and so simple that the most inexperienced person of limited education, by a careful perusal of its contents, can qualify himself, not only to take part in an ordinary meeting, but even to act as chairman of the same and acquit himself with credit. It has been privilege of the author to attend hundreds of meetings of various kinds and he has observed that an overwhelming majority is often entirely at the mercy of a small minority which happens to have the more skilled parliamentarians as leaders. There is a woeful lack of parliamentary knowledge among farmers and farmers' sons, which often places them at a decided disadvantage in a mixed gathering.

This booklet has not been prepared with big profits in 176 view, but simply to fill a “long-felt want.” Some very able writers on the subject have been consulted, but their dictum has not always been followed. The author admits that numerous close points in parliamentary practice have been entirely ignored, partly because a knowledge of them is not ordinarily necessary, and partly because a discussion of mere technicalities would complicate the subject.

Should anyone desire to become a parliamentary expert he should follow up the subject by a careful study of Cushing's and Jefferson's Manuals, Roberts' Rules of Order, the rules of State Legislatures and of Congress, and Hinds' Precedents, together with such decisions of the higher courts as may bear on the subject.

The Author.

177

APPENDIX SOME CHAPTERS ON PARLIAMENTARY LAW

CHAPTER I PRIMARY INFORMATION

1. Origin —Parliamentary Law takes its name from the English Parliament, or Congress, one of the very oldest deliberative bodies in the world. The Rules of Parliament, modified by the experience of other deliberative bodies, and adjusted to meet changing conditions, constitute what is now termed Parliamentary Law.
2. Definition —The term is used to designate the rules that govern all deliberative assemblies.
3. What Is a Deliberative Assembly —Any body of people that meet to transact any business whatever in which all of them are mutually concerned may be termed a deliberative assembly.

Library of Congress

4. Its Importance —It may be readily seen from the definition here given how very essential some knowledge of this subject becomes to the average citizen. It ranks next in importance to arithmetic in the ordinary affairs of life, and should be taught in the public schools.

5. Every Person, no matter how humble a station in life he may occupy, will sooner or later be placed in a position where a knowledge at least of the first principles of Parliamentary practice will be of more or less value.

6. Most Works on the subject are not only rather high priced, but are too complicated. It is the purpose of these “easy lessons” to gradually lead the reader, step by step, by slow and simple stages, to such a knowledge of the subject as to qualify him to take part in any ordinary debating or literary society, farmers' club, Grange, or local union, Society of Equity, or to preside over the same in a satisfactory manner.

7. There is a difference in the ability to acquire knowledge. With some it is very marked, especially where hard study is required, and where each process is unfolded step by step, and a knowledge of all the rules and principles that has preceded is essential to further progress. This would be largely true in the study of mathematics and of some foreign language.

8. Method Used —I have thought it best in preparing this work to commence at the very beginning, and wish the reader to always bear in mind that the rules and suggestions that follow will apply to any deliberative assembly as well as to a farmers' meeting.

We will take as our guide a supposed meeting called to form a farmers' club. As already stated this model may be used for almost any sort of gathering.

Let us imagine that someone calls a meeting at a certain time and at a fixed place to form a farmers' club. When the designated hour arrives someone, but generally the person calling the meeting, though anyone may do so, will arise and say: “The meeting

Library of Congress

(or the house) will come to order.” It then becomes the duty of everyone present to cease conversation and pay attention to the speaker, who will proceed to say: “I nominate John Doe (naming someone) as chairman of this meeting. Is there a second?” Someone in the house will say, “I second the motion.” The speaker will then put the motion as follows: “As many as may be (or are) in favor of John Doe acting as chairman of this meeting will say ‘aye’” (pronounced I), and after they have responded, he will add, “those opposed will say ‘no’,” If the affirmative vote (the ayes) is greater than the “noes,” he will say, “the motion prevails (or is carried) and John Doe has been elected chairman and will proceed to take charge of the meeting.” John Doe has the right to decline and should he do so, other names must be substituted until someone is found who will accept. Should the original motion be voted down, the party who called the house to order should call for nominations from the audience, and follow the form outlined above until someone is finally chosen, for without a chairman no business can be transacted. The party declared elected should at once go forward to the platform or desk, or whatever place may be designated, and take charge of the meeting. He will say, “The house will come to order. The next thing is the selection of a secretary. Nominations are in order.” Anyone present is then at liberty to say, “I nominate Richard Roe (naming any person in the audience) for secretary.” Generally one or more persons will say, “I second the motion.” The chairman will then proceed to put the motion as follows, using the same formula that was adopted in his own 179 election: “As many as are in favor of Richard Roe acting as secretary of this meeting will say ‘aye’” (after a pause of sufficient length to allow a response), “those opposed will say ‘no’,” If in his opinion, judging by the sound of the majority, have voted “aye,” the chairman will declare the motion carried, and that Richard Roe has been elected secretary. The person thus elected will get writing materials, take his seat at the table or desk, and proceed to make a record of the transactions of the meeting. It sometimes happens that some persons present are not satisfied with the nominations for chairman or secretary. If so, they can name their choice and it is then the duty of the presiding officer, or the man acting as chairman, to put the motion in the following form, beginning with the first nomination: “As many as may be in favor of John Doe acting as secretary will arise

Library of Congress

and stand until counted.” He will then count those on their feet, announce the number, and then request them to be seated. He will then ask those in favor of Richard Roe, that is, the next man named, to rise and go through the same process, and so, if necessary, with others, the person having the greatest number, providing it is a majority of all, will be declared elected.

Should a multitude of candidates be named, the vote must be taken with the one receiving the least number on each vote eliminated, that is, dropped. Should there be a tie the chairman, after announcing the fact, will proceed to vote, or without doing so formally, may declare his choice elected.

To head off a disposition to name a multiplicity of candidates, anyone at any stage of the proceedings may move that “the nominations be closed,” and this motion being adopted, will compel a selection from those already named, provided all do not decline.

A chairman and a secretary having been selected the meeting is now presumably open for the transaction of business. It will then be in order for the chairman, or anyone, to arise and state the object of the meeting. Informal remarks from any or all present may be called for in order to get the sense of the gathering.

Should any considerable number desire to proceed to the organization of a club, it will be in order for anyone so expressing himself to move the appointment of a committee, of any designated number, to draft a constitution and by-laws. (A brief outline of the subjects to be covered may be found in another part of this work.) This committee is generally named by the 180 chairman, though the names may be included in the motion itself or selected by the house. Should the presiding officer make the appointment, he generally names the mover of the motion as chairman of the committee as a matter of courtesy. Before this action is taken the names of all those desiring to become charter members are handed in to the secretary.

Library of Congress

It sometimes happens that a majority of those attending the meeting are opposed to an organization, but they have no right to take any course of action tending to prevent those who do desire to proceed from going ahead with the work. So it would be better, instead of moving that “we organize a farmers' club,” to simply ask those who desire to form a club to give their names to the secretary.

About all that can be done now is to take an adjournment to a future date, say two weeks, to allow the committee time to draft a constitution and by-laws.

At the next meeting the chairman and secretary will take their accustomed places, and at the appointed hour, or as soon thereafter as any considerable number of members may be present, the presiding officer will call the meeting to order and have the minutes of the previous meeting read, corrected, if necessary, and approved. He will then call upon the committee to report, which report may be read either by the chairman of the committee or by someone designated as secretary of the committee, or by the regular secretary of the club. It will then be in order to move to adopt the constitution and by-laws. This may be done as a whole or seriatim—that is, one section at a time.

Each article may be debated or amended, that is, changed, in any particular. Ample time, that is, a whole session should be given to the constitution, though with the suggestions made in another chapter, the work should not be very difficult.

Following the adoption of the constitution and by-laws, the permanent officers provided for should then be elected, the first officers being only temporary.

181

CHAPTER II DUTIES OF THE CHAIRMAN

This chapter will be devoted entirely to the duties of the presiding officer, for the business of no deliberative assembly can be speedily and properly transacted unless the chairman fully understands the rule governing the meeting, and exercises both tact and discretion in

Library of Congress

applying them. The author of this booklet has seen many gathering thrown into turmoil and confusion, sometimes breaking up in disorder, for the lack of a little knowledge and the use of a little “mother wit” by the presiding officer.

1. Above all things the chairman must never hesitate. It is, however, allowable for him to permit a person making a point of order to cite his authority and to briefly argue the point. This device is often resorted to by chairmen who are not sure of their own ground, and need a little time to think. But a decision should not be delayed. Nothing could be worse than for the members to get the impression that the chairman is lacking in Parliamentary knowledge.

2. He should remember and bear in mind at all times that the real purpose of Parliamentary Law is to facilitate the transaction of business, while safeguarding the rights of the minority.

3. He should keep cool, and while being firm, should not act in an arbitrary manner calculated to provoke a member or arouse his resentment. By using a little tact he can very often rectify or correct a misunderstanding among members that if followed to run on might in time prove serious.

4. While giving his own side the benefit of the doubt he should never exhibit partisanship. Indeed, he should lean a little towards the other side if anything. A person fairly beaten or out-voted, if he feels he has had a square deal, generally yields gracefully.

5. It often becomes the duty of the chairman to appoint committees. A discreet chairman, though Parliamentary Law does not absolutely require it, will appoint the mover of a resolution that a committee be appointed, the chairman of the committee, or give some good reason why he cannot do so.

Library of Congress

6. While appeals from the decision of the chair, which any two members can make immediately following a decision, before any other business has intervened, should not be taken slightly, yet when they are taken, if in order, the chairman should briefly give his reasons for so deciding and allow equal time for his questioners to state their side of the case, and then cheerfully put the question to the house in his form: "Shall the decision of the chair stand as the judgment of the assembly?" Ordinarily a majority may reverse the chair, but it is very common for deliberative assemblies, by a special rule, to provide that a two-thirds vote is necessary. No second appeal from the decision of the chair can be taken while one appeal is pending.

7. In recognizing members, or granting them the floor, some discretion is allowed the chair, and in any event no appeal will lie from his decision. Usually if there is opposition the chair will recognize one from each side alternately. However, the chair should never decline to recognize a member claiming the floor except for good and sufficient reasons that are apparent or can be readily explained to the satisfaction of any fair-minded person.

8. It is the duty of the chair to enforce the rules of the assembly, and to direct all proceedings in a Parliamentary manner. Any member of the assembly can at any time as a matter of privilege call the attention of the chair to any infraction or violation of its rules, and demand that the rules be enforced.

9. It is the privilege, though not an imperative duty, of the chair to offer suggestions for the purpose of facilitating business. An expert chairman by merely suggesting, "It is next order to do so and so," can often secure the transaction of more business and have it done "decently and in order," and to the satisfaction of everyone present, in an hour's time, than a meeting left to its own initiative can do in half a day. The chairman must be careful to let the meeting appear to run itself, and keep clear of anything that might seem like dictation. It is entirely proper, however, for the chairman to say, "Will somebody make a motion," to do anything that would naturally be in order at that time.

Library of Congress

10. The importance of committing to memory and having on his tongue's end certain formulas, some of which are given in this chapter, cannot be too strongly impressed upon the chairman. Very many things may be done to facilitate business by unanimous consent, that is, without a formal motion. It is safe to say, 183 that more than one-half of the business of Congress, which contains many skilled parliamentarians is now transacted in this manner. The usual form is to say, "Without objections such and such a thing will be considered as done." As, for example, "Without objections the minutes will stand approved as read." This statement taking the place of a formal motion that "the minutes be approved," thereby saving time.

11. Time is always an object to be considered in an ordinary meeting. This fact the chairman should always bear in mind. No substantial right of a minority should be denied or greatly abridged by the arbitrary action of the chair, and yet experience will suggest to him short cuts leading to the same result that may be taken without giving the members any just cause for complaint.

12. The right of a member to have the question fairly and clearly stated is a matter of the very highest privilege—a fact the chairman must always remember. To state a question once is not enough. Before a vote is taken the chairman should be fully satisfied that all understand the question before the house. *It would do no harm, if after stating the matter under consideration*, he should say, "Do you all understand the question?" to make sure it is understood. It has become a very common practice in Congress, pending the submission of a question for a member to arise and say, "Mr. Speaker, a Parliamentary inquiry!" "The gentleman will state it," is the reply by the speaker. A question is then asked, and answered by the speaker, before proceeding further, in order to supply the inquirer with information necessary to enable him to vote intelligently.

13. A chairman is not bound to entertain any and every motion that may be made. Absurd, frivolous and foolish motions may simply be ruled out of order. Motions of this nature are sometimes made to merely annoy the chairman. They should all be promptly declared

Library of Congress

out of order and no appeal from the decision should be entertained. Following a rule of Congress, adopted not many years ago, *a new class of motions known as dilatory*, has been added to the above which a chairman need not entertain.

These motions, while in order under Parliamentary Law, when it is obvious that the mover merely intends to delay proceedings for no good purpose, the chairman is justified in ignoring. A good example is the motion to adjourn, which ordinarily is a privileged motion of the highest class, yielding only to a motion to fix the time to which to adjourn.

184

Motions to adjourn could not be allowed to follow each other, when we vote showed that a large majority did not desire to adjourn, for in that case two persons could prevent the transaction of any business, even though all but the two members are in favor of remaining and going through the program. No substantial right of the two would be curtailed or denied even though the motion be not put, since they do not have the power to compel an adjournment.

14. The chairman should remember that any contemplated action that in effect would suspend a rule, either of the club itself, or of General Parliamentary Law, requires a two-thirds vote. Some of these questions are very close, and all authorities on Parliamentary Law do not agree.

For instance, a farmer's club adopts rules which provides for a standing program, say, as follows:

1. Calling to Order.
2. Calling Roll.
3. Reading and Approval of the Minutes.
4. Literary Exercises.

Library of Congress

5. Debate.
6. Initiation of New Members.
7. Unfinished Business.
8. New Business.

It were better for the chairman to rule that any change in this order, such as having the initiation of new members come right after the reading of the minutes, requires a two-thirds votes. Or that a motion to adjourn, while the program is being carried out, requires a two-thirds vote, the adjournment, in effect, suspending the part of the program that has not been reached.

15. The right of any deliberative assembly to protect itself from annoyance is fully guaranteed by statute law. Severe penalties are provided for disturbers.

Should any person present, outsider or members, be guilty of any conduct that disturbs or annoys the meeting, the chairman, whose business it is to maintain order, should gently admonish him; on a repetition of the offense he should warn him, and if he persists he can order him from the room, and if necessary forcibly eject him, using only so much force as may be necessary to accomplish the object. Further observations on this subject may be found in the chapter on decorum.

185

yet any ordinary person who masters the suggestions contained in this chapter should make a very creditable presiding officer and any farmer's club, or ordinary meeting, where expert knowledge of the technical forms of procedure or precedence of motions is not yet required.

186

CHAPTER III RIGHTS AND DUTIES OF MEMBERS

The reader who has absorbed the two preceding chapters the got an idea of how business is conducted, and by following the formulas outlined in another chapter might preside fairly well where no skilled parliamentary took part, bu he would soon be lost or puzzled if any dispute arose, and this could scarcely be avoided where all were not of the same mind.

In the last chapter we treated of the duties of the president. The Bible tells us that “All things should be done decently and in order.”

It is obvious, first, that only one person can occupy the floor, and have the attention of the speaker or house, and that only one question can be considered at a time. For two persons to attempt to hold the floor and talk, or for two motions of a similar nature to be up for consideration, would lead to confusion and disorder, and could not be allowed.

Parliamentary Law provides a way to obviate this difficulty.

We will first treat of the rights of a person who has got the floor. Parliamentary Law itself does not limit the time of a speaker, but permits any deliberative assembly to limit the time by special rule, which is very often done.

However, there are several ways by which a person can be compelled to yield the floor without in any way infringing on his parliamentary rights. 1. He is required to confine his remarks to the question before the house. For instance, when the subject for debate is, the best breed of cattle, he could not be allowed to wander off and discuss the relative merits of George Washington and Napoleon Bonaparte as military commanders. 2. He must use respectful language towards those present.

The chairman himself, or any member, can interrupt a speaker by the remark, “I call the gentleman to order,” or, “I make a point of order.” It then becomes the duty of the person having the floor to cease speaking and to take his seat until the point of order is settle.

Library of Congress

The challenging party will in a few words state his point of order, and the presiding officer will say, if sustained, 187 ‘The point is well taken,” or, “The point is overruled, the speaker will proceed.” If the point is “well taken” and sustained, the speaker cannot claim the floor again unless by the consent of a majority of the members present. This consent is generally presumed in the first instance, but any member can require a vote to be taken on the matter, and a majority can deny the offending member the floor again.

He can also be taken from the floor by questions of privilege being raised, which will be treated in another chapter.

As a rule no speaker can be interrupted while speaking in order until the time limit has expired, except by his own consent, or by the chairman, when he desires to make a statement for the information of members.

It is perfectly proper in the midst of a speech (unless the speaker has stated that he does not desire to be interrupted) for anyone to say, “Mr. Chairman, I desire to ask a question.”

The chairman will then politely request the speaker to suspend while the question is being propounded, but the speaker is not bound to answer the question. He can ignore it if he so desires. All members should pay respectful attention to the remarks of anyone having the floor, and not seek by catcalls or hisses or other manifestations of disapproval to embarrass or annoy anyone. The right of the speaker to a patient hearing, even though no one present may agree with him, is sacred, and should be enforced by the presiding officer.

This statement, however, does not remove the obligation from the speaker himself to be courteous and to keep his good nature and to not insist too strenuously on all his parliamentary rights.

In debating a question upon which there is a difference of opinion, members favoring and opposing a proposition should alternate. That is, a speech in favor should be followed by

Library of Congress

one against, and members should be recognized in this order by the chairman if there be no objection, although strictly speaking, the person first addressing the presiding officer would be entitled to the floor.

While the chairman should not be partial, yet some discretion should be allowed him in the matter of assigning the floor.

If an interruption would tend to embarrass a speaker he should preface his remarks with the statement, "I do not wish to be interrupted," a wish which all present should respect, and to which the chairman should pay due regard.

188

It sometimes happens that charges are preferred against members, or action contemplated looking to the fining, suspension or expulsion of members. While these matters are considered in another chapter, a few suggestions right here might not be out of place.

No precipitate or hasty action reflecting on a member should ever be taken. Every member is entitled to a fair and impartial trial, and to be heard in his own defense before judgment may be pronounced against him. Much less should any action be taken against him in his absence save only the dropping of his name from the roll for failure to pay dues after repeated notices of his delinquency.

No member may be fined in his absence.

It is the duty of all persons to observe the rules and to pay due respect to the presiding officer.

189

CHAPTER IV MOTIONS

Library of Congress

If all motions had to be acted upon before anything else could be considered, and voted up or voted down, it would be comparatively easy to conduct a deliberative assembly “decently and in order,” and a very few simple rules would be all that would be necessary. But such is not the case.

Motions may be divided into three classes. Principal, subsidiary and incidental.

Any matter brought before a club when nothing else is pending may be regarded as a principal motion.

Let us go back to the organization of a farmers' club. Suppose a committee had been appointed to draft rules of its government—a constitution and by-laws—and an adjournment taken to a certain date. When the time arrived the chairman of the first meeting and the secretary would take their places and the chairman would call the house to order and have the minutes of the former meeting read, corrected, if necessary, and adopted or approved. He would then call for the report of the committee on constitution and by-laws. This report being submitted and read, it would be in order to move to adopt the report. This could be done as a whole or section by section or partly by each method.

This motion being made it would be called a principal motion, to which subsidiary motions could be applied.

First of all it would be subject to amendment, that is, to any desired change. For instance, the name might be The Know Nothing Club, which might not suit everybody. It would then be in order for anyone to move to strike out “Know Nothing” and insert “Progressive.” If this motion prevailed it would not then be in order to again strike out “Progressive” and insert some other name.

While the motion to strike out “Know Nothing” and insert “Progressive” was pending, however, that is, before it had been voted on, it would be in order to amend the amendment by inserting some other name for “Progressive” by any number of trials.

Library of Congress

However, this matter of name is generally settled by allowing 190 anyone to suggest a name, and adopting the one that could command a majority of the votes.

As a rule all subsidiary motions must be voted on or disposed of in some way before a vote can be taken on the principal motion.

Motions Withdrawn —In general any motion may be withdrawn by the mover with the consent of the second before any action be taken upon it, although it may have been the subject of debate.

The name having been adopted, the objects of the club next come up for consideration. The objects as given may be amended by unanimous consent, that is, by suggestion or by motion. Any motion to amend takes precedence, that is, must be acted on if not withdrawn before a motion to adopt can be put. A skilled parliamentarian, when he has got things' to suit him makes a motion that it be adopted, and then if he can gain the floor moves the previous question on its adoption. The chairman must then put the question, "All in favor of the previous question will say 'aye,' etc." If two-thirds support the motion, that is, demand the previous question, the effect of the motion is to cut off all debate and all further motions to amend and compel an immediate vote on the matter pending. To further clinch the business it would be in order for anyone who voted on the prevailing side to move to reconsider the vote by which the motion was adopted, and then without yielding the floor to move that this motion—to reconsider—be laid on the table, which, if it prevails, will end the matter, for only one motion to reconsider can be made and a motion to take it from the table is never in order at any time. This is the method invariably used in Congress to head off all objections to bills once passed.

When a principal motion has been duly made and seconded there are a number of ways to dispose of it which will be briefly treated. Ordinarily it will be debated at length and then either adopted or rejected by a direct vote. This is the simplest way to dispose of it. But a number of so-called subsidiary motions may be applied to it, all of which are in order and

Library of Congress

must be first considered and disposed of in some way before a direct vote on the principal motion will be in order.

Usually the friends of a motion or proposition, after a reasonable debate, though they may do so without any debate whatever, will demand the previous question, and if they can command the support of two-thirds of all the members present they can compel a vote at once upon the main question.

The “previous question” being a mere name is equivalent to the motion, “I move that all debate now cease and a vote be taken on the pending proposition.”

Some writers hold that it should require a two-thirds vote to order the previous question, but a majority vote is all that is necessary, otherwise a minority of barely one-third could virtually control the proceedings.

The opponents of a principal motion, when it is first presented, may “object to its consideration, in which case it would require a majority vote to take it up. But the usual way for those opposed to a proposition is for them make a motion to “indefinitely postpone” the matter. This motion opens the whole subject for debate. However, the one who makes the motion can put it in this form: “I move the [naming the subject] be indefinitely postponed, and on that motion I demand the previous question.” This motion cannot be divided and if adopted the question must be immediately put and determined, so that a majority led by a skilled parliamentarian can easily prevent a minority from consuming the time by frivolous and minor questions to which a majority are opposed or do not wish to consider.

A motion “to lay on the table” is also often made, and not being debatable, if carried removes the subject from consideration for the time. A motion to take from the table not then being in order. While a simple motion to “indefinitely postpone” is debatable, yet it cannot be amended in any way.

Library of Congress

Having failed to get rid of a principal motion in the manner indicated, it is now subject to amendment. Amendments have three recognized forms. 1. Strike out some parts or words. 2. Insert something. 3. Strike out the insert something in the place of what it is proposed to strike out. The amendment itself may be amended the same as the original motion, but the amendment to the amendment cannot itself be amended.

To illustrate, suppose that a salary of \$10 was proposed in a principal motion. It would be in order to strike out \$10 and insert \$5 as an amendment. Someone could then move to strike out \$5 and insert \$7, but here he must stop. Should the motion prevail then the question would be to strike out the original \$10 and insert \$7, and should this carry the \$7 could not again be struck out and some other figure inserted. If it should fail to carry no motion to strike out the \$10 and insert \$12 or \$20 or indeed any other sum would be in order.

The general rule is that the assembly having once adopted a proposition a motion to strike it out again would not be in order. But this rule, will not interfere with the striking out of a whole section or subject, no matter how much it may have been amended, unless it had been adopted in the identical words it is proposed to strike out. All pending amendments must be disposed of in some way before a vote can be taken on the main or principal question.

It is also in order to move to refer a principal question to a committee with or without instructions.

It is also in order to move to postpone the consideration of a matter to a future date, and this motion can be made when amendments are pending, but not when the house is considering the question of indefinite postponement.

An amendment to a question must be germane—that is, it must relate to it—but it is in order no matter ludicrous or foolish it might be or directly change the sense.

For instance, the author, when secretary of a college society, recorded in the minutes that “the society was entertained by a couple of gentlemen (outsiders) by a ten minutes’ address on a political question.” A waggish member on the other side of the political fence moved to strike out the word “entertained” and insert “bored,” a motion although entirely changing the sentence, after citation of authorities, was held strictly in order.

There are a few incidental questions or motions that may be made and must be decided while principal and subsidiary questions are pending. These are five in number: Questions of order, motions for the reading of papers, permission to withdraw a motion, suspension of a rule, and the disposition of an amendment to an amendment, which has already been treated.

193

CHAPTER V PRIVILEGED MOTIONS

Parliamentary Law recognizes certain motions as privileged. That is, they can be made at any time and must be acted on at once.

The first of these is a motion to adjourn. This motion when made in its simplest form, “I move we adjourn,” is popularly supposed to be “always in order,” but this is not true. The motion cannot be made when a similar motion has just been voted down without any intervening business. Were it otherwise, any two members could hold up an assembly indefinitely and prevent it transacting any business by the simple device of keeping a motion to adjourn constantly before the house.

It cannot be entertained when the assembly is considering the time and place of holding the next meeting, when it is taking a vote, or when a member is speaking, unless he yields for that purpose. Nor can it be made when the assembly has already fixed a time when it will adjourn by standing rule or otherwise. And if repeatedly voted down the chairman will refuse to entertain it on the broad ground that it is evidently the purpose of the mover to

Library of Congress

prevent the assembly from transacting its business. From this decision of the chairman no appeal can be taken.

Questions that relate directly to the rights and privileges of the assembly itself, or of any of its members, are also privileged. While it is the duty of the chair to enforce the orders of the assembly, yet it is the privilege of any member to call his attention to the matter by rising to a question of privilege or making a "point of order." While a "point of order" is privileged it also has its limitations. An assembly having once determined that a certain is not a point of order, the decision of the house must be accepted, and the same point cannot be renewed on a future occasion. For instance, the house having once decided that the use of certain words in debate was not a breach of decorum the same identical question cannot be again raised.

Points of order and questions of privilege must first be decided by the chairman. They are not debatable if the matters from 194 which they sprung are undebatable, or when a question that does not allow of debate is pending.

An appeal may be taken from the decision of the chair by any two members if made at the time the decision is rendered before any other business has intervened, and the house may reverse this decision by a majority vote, unless it has made some rule to the contrary. On this question the chairman is allowed to state his reasons for his decision. The question shall be put in this form: "Shall the decision of the chair stand as the judgment of the house?" A tie vote sustains the chair, and the chairman can vote to make it a tie.

So-called orders of the day are the third class of privileged questions. If a time has been fixed for the consideration of a certain matter, it is in order for any member to move to take it up or to "call it up" in ordinary procedure, when the hour previously fixed for its consideration arrives.

Even if a person is speaking a member may interrupt him by making a "point of order," and calling attention to the business fixed for that hour. If the matter is not then taken up it

Library of Congress

most be disposed of in some way by a two-thirds vote. The usual way is to simply make a motion that the subject be postponed until final action be taken on whatever may then be pending.

It is sufficient, in order to attract the attention of the chairman, for a member to say, "I rise to a question of privilege," or "a point of order." But, of course, should this be done when another point of order or question of privilege is before the house, it cannot be considered, and the chairman would simply say, "this point cannot be entertained until the matter before the house is disposed of in some way." When the pending matter is cleared away the subject may be brought up again if the member is so inclined.

195

CHAPTER VI DECORUM

1. This is a general term covering all manner of conduct in a deliberative assembly.
2. No outsider, that is, no person not actually a member of the assembly has any right under any pretext to disturb its proceedings in any manner. The only exception to this rule is the right of a sheriff or other officer to serve writs directed against the assembly itself. To violently break in upon a legal assembly and interfere with its proceedings is a very serious offense for which the statute law provide severe penalties.

Any member of the assembly, by filing a complaint in legal form before a justice of the peace, can call an offender to account for his conduct.

3. It does not require any action by the assembly itself in a formal way, although it would not be out of order for the assembly to pass a resolution reciting the action complained of and directing the president or other officer, or indeed any member, to cause the arrest of the offending party.

Library of Congress

4. If, for instance, an assembly had a legal right to hold a meeting at a schoolhouse at a stated time, and a person living nearby, with the intent to annoy or disturb the meeting, should by himself or in conjunction with others make a loud noise with his voice, beating drums, or in any other manner actually disturb the “peace of mind” of anyone attending the meeting, he would be guilty and could be punished.
5. Bear in mind that when a presiding officer has once been properly selected that the meeting is thenceforth under his control. His authority within reasonable limits is absolute.
6. It is customary for all deliberative assemblies to choose or appoint a marshal or officer to “keep order.” This official is under the direct authority of the chairman or president, unless otherwise provided for by the rules. The marshal has the right to call to his assistance anyone in the room.
7. In case any person in the house becomes disorderly, with 196 or without warning, the chairman has a right to order him to leave the room.
8. If he should refuse, the chairman could order his forcible removal, and should this be undertaken, sufficient force may be used to accomplish the end in view, no matter if the offending party is severely injured, or in very extreme cases, even killed. It would, however, be necessary for the assembly to show to the court that “it used only as much force, as was reasonably necessary to maintain its own legal rights.”
9. While the above is true, it would be much better all around for the secretary or chairman to read to the house this entire chapter, in order that any disturbers might be fully advised as to the rights of the assembly, and should the disturber then persist, he should be warned in a kindly manner by the chairman to the effect that he was disturbing the meeting, and requested to keep quiet. This, ordinarily, would be sufficient.

Library of Congress

10. The foregoing relates especially to outsiders. With actual members of the assembly it would be somewhat different. But in any case the presumptions are all with the presiding officer.

11. In law the chairman is presumed to conduct the meeting according to the forms of parliamentary procedure, and it would require strong and convincing evidence to the contrary to overcome this presumption.

12. In the chapter on "Duties of the President," plain and explicit directions have been given to govern the action of the chairman under almost any conceivable circumstances, and any member has an undoubted right rising "to a point of order" to call his attention to any departure from the rules and directions there laid down.

13. In any dispute with the chairman a member has an undoubted right to appeal from his decision to that of the house itself, that is, to the members present. As stated elsewhere it will require an actual majority of all the members present to reverse the decision, a tie vote sustaining the chairman, and the chairman himself may vote to make a tie. To illustrate: The question being put in its proper form, "Shall the decision of the chair stand as the judgment of the house?" there being twenty present, including the chairman, and nine should vote "aye" and ten "no," the chair would be sustained, as he voting with the nine "ayes" would make it a tie.

14. Suppose the presiding officer himself should become disorderly 197 orderly and wilfully and deliberately disregard his duties, should refuse to put motions when properly made, and declare motions lost that actually carried, and so forth. What is the remedy? Provisions have been made by law for the impeachment and removal of public officials for misbehavior in office, which need not be quoted here. It is almost inconceivable that any president of a literary society, farmers' club, Society of Equity, Grange, or similar organization, would so conduct himself intentionally. There is really no reason for his doing so. Nothing could be gained by such a course in the long run. Any temporary advantage

Library of Congress

that might follow would surely be lost in the end. In general it may be said that a majority has the right to rule. Should a majority support such high-handed proceedings on the part of the chairman, the minority had better quietly withdraw and from an organization of their own. Should the majority disapprove of the actions of the president, they have a number of remedies. They might let things run till the end of his term of office. If they had a vice president who stood with them they might declare the office vacant and proceed to elect another to fill the vacancy. In that case, at a regular meeting or a meeting called for that special purpose of which all the members were notified, a member should arise and introduce a resolution reading substantially as follows: "Whereas, on [naming the time and place] 'Mr. John Smith' [naming the party], president of this club or society, in defiance of all Parliamentary Law and Practice, and in utter disregard of the rules of this club formally adopted, did [sample charge] refuse to entertain and submit a motion to [name the purpose] properly made by [naming the mover] and [here recite any other act of a similar nature of which he may be guilty].

"Therefore, Be it Resolved by [naming the organization] that by these acts the said party has justly forfeited the office of president of this [name here], and we hereby declare said office vacant."

On the introduction of this resolution Parliamentary Law requires the president to immediately surrender the chair to the vice president, this being a matter directly affecting himself. In case he should not do so, the vice president should himself assume the office, and proceed to entertain the motion or resolution. After reasonable debate someone should move the previous question, which being seconded by a majority of all the members present, the resolution itself should be put and the vote upon it 198 as an extra precaution taken by a roll call and the names of all the members voting "aye" and "no" should be recorded.

15. A new president to fill the vacancy for the unexpired term should then be chosen in the usual manner.

Library of Congress

This drastic action is seldom or never necessary, but the form here given is the proper one to follow should the occasion require it.

16. Disorderly or boisterous conduct on the part of members can generally be held in check by a special rule providing for a fine to be assessed by the chairman or by the house against unruly members, coupled with a proviso that the member stand suspended until the fine is paid.

17. In general I would add that members should observe the ordinary decencies and proprieties of life. Smoking should not be indulged in if ladies are present. This in law would be regarded as disorderly conduct if anyone should complain.

18. Rule and uncouth language in debate should be avoided. It is scarcely necessary to suggest that anything bordering on obscenity would be wholly out of place.

19. It would be well to remember also that only one person can speak at a time, and but one on a subject, till all others who desire to speak have spoken.

20. To be models of deportment at all times, bearing in mind the Golden Rule, "To Do Unto Others As You Would Have Them Do Unto You," should be the aim and object of all people—the young especially—who take part in literary societies and deliberative assemblies of any nature.

199

CHAPTER VII COMMITTEES

1. Every deliberative body, almost from necessity, has occasion to elect or appoint committees. A few persons can handle a subject much more intelligently than a large number for many reasons.

Library of Congress

2. Committees may be divided into two classes: (1) Standing committees; (2) Special or select committees. Any organization of a permanent nature will have use for a number of standing committees elected or appointed for a certain stated time.

3. In an ordinary assembly meeting, say for the first time, the first step after a temporary organization has been effected is to appoint a committee on credentials, generally consisting of from three to seven members, sometimes more.

4. The duty of this committee is to ascertain and report on whom are entitled to take part in the deliberations of the meeting or convention. If credentials are required they examine them and make up a list from these credentials of the membership. In addition to this they hear other evidence of persons claiming the right to participate in the doings of the assembly.

5. The report of this committee would be substantially in the following form: "Your committee on credentials beg leave to submit the following report. We find the following persons duly entitled to seats in this convention." [Here follows the list of names.]

If the gathering should be state-wide, it would perhaps be better to arrange the list in alphabetical order by counties. To illustrate: Suppose it should be an annual meeting of the State Federation of Farmers' Clubs in Minnesota. The report should begin with "Anoka County, Cedar Farmers' Club, John Smith, Wm. Brown, etc." Counties beginning with "B" would follow, and so on down the entire list, ending with Waseca or Washington.

This form would also enable the press representatives present to get a line on the makeup of the convention, and aid them in making an intelligent report.

6. After the list of those bearing credentials has been made up the committee should add: "We also find that the following named persons have submitted evidence tending to show that they are entitled to seats in this assembly, and we recommend that their

Library of Congress

names be placed on the roll of delegates.” [Here follows the list in the same order as given above.]

A report of this nature, if there be opposition, as is sometimes the case, should be divided. First, a vote should be taken on that part of the report covering and including the names of those submitting credentials. As nobody could very well object to anyone presenting credentials filled out in due and proper form, this part of the report should be unanimously adopted. If there be opposition to the seating of those not having proper credentials when the vote is taken the persons whose right to a seat is disputed should refrain from voting, leaving the matter to be decided by those whose right to participate in the proceedings are uncontested. No man should be permitted to pass judgment on his own right to a seat.

The report of this committee, as indeed of all others, should end with the words, “All of which is respectfully submitted.”

The names of all of the members of the committee should be appended, though when the report is unanimous the name of one as chairman would be sufficient.

7. The proper motion to make on the presentation of this report is, “I move the report be accepted (or adopted), and the committee be continued with leave to report at any time.”

The purpose of such a motion, as may readily be seen, is to allow belated delegates to hand in their credentials or evidence and have it acted on at once.

The powers and duties of this committee, unless sooner discharged by a direct vote, ends with the final adjournment of the assembly.

8. In the organization of almost any club or society, after temporary officers have been elected, it is proper and customary to appoint a committee on constitution and by-laws, though this is no longer absolutely necessary. By following the “forms” given in another

Library of Congress

chapter in this booklet, this committee, or the house itself, could very quickly submit and adopt all the necessary rules to put it in complete working order.

9. In all bodies of a literary character, as for instance a lyceum, a committee on program is essential.

The duty of this committee is to arrange the program two or 201 more weeks in advance of the meeting, and to notify all persons of the part they are to take, so that they may have time to prepare. In farmers' clubs, especially where the children participate, the school teacher is one of the most efficient members of this committee.

This committee also sees to the publication of this program in the local newspaper, and sends in a report of the doings at each meeting.

The program committee is generally chosen for a term of three months or longer.

10. Investigating committees are numerous and varied. They are appointed to find out something the meeting desires and has the right to know, and which one or two or a small number can learn or discover easier and fully as satisfactory as the whole assembly.

These committees derive their authority from the assembly itself, and the motion to appoint the committee should include specifically their powers and duties. However, the authority or duty of any committee may be extended, explained or abridged by a subsequent motion. Any committee may be summarily discharged by a majority vote at any time, unless the effect of the motion if adopted would be to suspend or antagonize some rule of the assembly, when it would require a two-thirds vote.

11. Committee of the whole house. Sometimes an assembly in the consideration of important matters formally resolves itself into what is called a committee of the whole. This is very frequently done in the United States House of Representatives in order to avoid certain rules that interfere with debate or action. Much better progress in perfecting a

Library of Congress

measure can generally be made as the assembly is hampered by fewer rules. In ordinary assemblies the work that might be done in committee of the whole can generally be performed by a smaller committee, and perfected if necessary by amendments submitted when the report is pending for final action. In committee of the whole the only motions relating to the matter under consideration are “to amend” or “to adopt. A motion to adjourn cannot be made, the proper motion to terminate the sitting being, “that the committee now rise and report.” In going into committee of the whole, the presiding officer will call some other member to the chair and when this committee “rises” the president again takes his place and the chairman 202 reports what has been done, and this report is then acted on the same as if it had been submitted by any other committee.

The following is the form used: “Mr. President. The committee of the whole house have had under consideration a [here name the subject], and have instructed me to report [here state actual condition of the subject-matter], and ask leave to sit again.”

This is probably all that is necessary to say on this subject here. If more technical knowledge is desired the reader is referred to Jefferson's Manual or Roberts' Rules of Order, which deal with the subject at some length.

Always bear in mind that a committee represents the body that created it, and has no more power or authority than has been conferred upon it.

It is entirely proper for a committee at any time to make a partial report and to ask for greater powers, or to have its duty more fully defined.

12. It is customary for the first named member to be the chairman, though the members may elect the chairman if they so desire. When the presiding officer appoints the committee he generally designates the chairman, in which case it would be binding upon the others.

Library of Congress

13. Committees should always consist of an odd number, so that there may be a majority and a minority.

14. In filing a unanimous report, that is, one to which all the members agree, the signature of the chairman alone is sufficient. But if any committeeman is unable to agree with the others, he is at liberty to file or submit a “minority report” embodying his own views.

Indeed, any number equal to the whole membership of the committee may be submitted. That is, each member may file his own individual views.

In case two or more reports are filed each member of the committee should sign the report with which he agrees, adding something to it as a “supplemental report” if he so desires.

15. In acting upon reports the majority is read first, then the minority. If more than one of these they are numbered. The usual motion, when the reports are before the assembly, is for someone to move that “the minority report no—if more than one—be substituted for the majority.” Each minority report should be voted on before that of the majority, otherwise the minority 203 would be deprived of the right to have its report considered at all!

16. The author has known of cases where a not overscrupulous member, favoring the majority, has sought to “shut out” all consideration of the views of the minority.

As soon as the minority report was read he moved its adoption, joining with the motion a demand for the “previous question.” If the latter demand had been sustained it would have carried with it an immediate vote on the majority report, and if this had prevailed, the minority would have been unable to present the report, since only one report on the subject could be adopted. While such action may be technically “in order”—all authors not being agreed—it is a “shabby trick” that should not be countenanced by anyone who believes in a “square deal.”

All reports should be received and each minority report should receive due consideration before final action be taken. The chairman should rule that a motion to substitute the minority for the majority report takes precedence of the motion to adopt the majority report, and must be voted on first.

17. In considering a complex matter it sometimes happens that on account of a multitude of suggestions, motions or amendments things get all tangled up, when a motion to refer the whole subject to a committee should be made.

This motion would be in order at any stage of the proceedings when the previous question was not ordered, and would often solve the difficulty.

18. A careful study of the chapter on "Motions" will further elucidate this subject.

204

CHAPTER VIII VOTING METHODS EXPLAINED

1. There are variety of ways by which the sense of a deliberative body may be taken. The very simplest of these is what may be called unanimous consent, that is, by silence. In Legislatures and in Congress by far the greater part of the business is transacted in this manner. In these bodies there are a large number of standing committees appointed—sometimes as many as fifty—in divide up the work. Numerous petitions are presented and bills intended to become laws are introduced to be referred to the appropriate committees. Under the rules a motion would be in order to "refer" in each case, which would require a vote. But as a matter of custom, to expedite business and save time, the speaker or presiding officer simply says "Without objection it will be so ordered or so referred." By these methods routine matters are all disposed of, though if a single objection be made, a formal motion and a vote would be necessary. Very much business of a similar nature in ordinary assemblies can be handled by a skilled presiding officer in the same manner. The words, "If no objections is offered," or "There being no objection," should always precede

Library of Congress

any action, as the use of these phrases gives everyone an opportunity to object or call for a formal vote.

2. The next, and very common method, is termed *viva voce*, or by the living voice. The Chairman uses the well-known formula, "Those in favor of the motion will say 'aye;' those opposed, 'no'," The chairman, judging by the volume of sound, will then say, "The 'ayes' (for 'noes') appear to have it," and waiting a moment for someone to object, and no one does so, he will add, "The 'ayes' (or 'noes') have it, the motion prevails" (or is carried or adopted in case of a resolution).

All members remaining silent, of course, are not counted either way when a vote is taken in this manner.

3. When the vote is so taken and anyone is in doubt as to the result, or in fact desires for any reason or no reason at all, he can call for a "division," which the presiding officer is bound to grant, unless special rules to the contrary have been made. This is usually taken by requesting "all who favor the motion to arise and stand and be counted."

205

While the presiding officer does the counting, yet it is the right of anyone to demand tellers or counters, and in that case the chair names one from each side to do the counting. The affirmative vote being taken, the negative vote is then ascertained in the same manner, and the number on each side reported to the chair, who announces the result, saying for a model, "21 have voted 'aye' (or in favor of the motion), 17 'no' (or against it). The motion is carried."

Those declining to arise are not counted either way unless the house is working under a special rule of its own which requires an affirmative vote of a majority of *all the members present*. In this case they are counted in the negative, or in opposition.

Library of Congress

When the vote is taken in this manner and a member stands up with “both sides” he should be so counted, or if having voted in the affirmative, and he has changed his mind, he can have his vote counted only in the negative on a request to this effect.

4. A more formal way of voting, and one which is required in many State Legislature by a constitutional provision, and in the National House of Representatives on demand of one-fifth of its members, by roll call. That is, by calling the list or roll of members by name and letting each one respond “aye” or “no.” The clerk writes down our marks each name in accordance with the answer. When the roll call is completed the names of those not responding are usually called a second time.

It is the right of any member to ask for a “verification.” When this is done the clerk will say. “Those understood as voting ‘aye’ are” [naming each member, generally in alphabetical order, so voting]. “Those understood as voting ‘no’ are” [naming the negative side like in manner]. When this is finished any member can say on which side he voted or desires to vote and he must be so recorded. It is a matter of the very highest privilege. I have included the method of holding up the hands in the rising or standing vote, as it is essentially the same. Sometimes men standing in ranks are asked to step forward one or two paces to form a “division,” and are then counted. Where no special rules have been adopted, the right of a single member to demand a roll call is not entirely clear, although that he may demand a “division” is very certain. Generally where the membership is very large and it takes a long time to call the roll a special rule to govern the matter is adopted. In small assemblies it would be better to have a roll call if anyone asks for it, especially if the pending 206 matter is important. In case the vote is taken in this manner the secretary should record the vote as actually taken, with the names of all the members, as a matter for future reference.

5. In many assemblies, especially in the election of officers, the special rules, require that the vote be taken by ballot. That is, each member writes the name of the candidate of

Library of Congress

his choice on a slip of paper, and these slips being collected are read off and the result recorded.

In voting in this manner a majority of all the votes are required for a choice. If there are several candidates, the lowest one on each ballot is generally dropped until a selection is made.

Where the rules require the vote to be taken by ballot, and there is only one candidate, to save time it is in order for someone to move that "The secretary be instructed to cast the unanimous vote of the convention for the candidate." If the motion refers to the secretary himself the president may cast the vote. This motion is only in order where there is but one candidate for the place.

In voting by ballot the chairman votes the same as the others, but cannot afterwards vote again in case of a tie.

In taking a rising vote the chairman may be counted if his vote will make the result a tie, in which case the motion would be lost.

Before a vote is taken the chairman should state the question clearly, and repeat it if necessary, for all to understand it, as no member should be required to vote on a matter he does not fully understand.

Generally speaking, all members should vote, though any member may be excused by the chair, if no one objects, or by the house.

The exception to this rule is when the motion pending relates to himself, in which case he is not permitted to vote.

If, however, the motion or resolution should affect or embrace two or more members, all of them can vote.

If this were not true a minority could take control of an assembly at any time by the simple device of including enough of the majority in a resolution affecting them all, which of course could not be permitted.

Unless the special rules prescribe the method, a motion stating how a vote shall be taken is always in order just before the question is started, and is decided by a majority.

207

CHAPTER IX RULES

1. Every deliberative body is competent to make its own rules, not conflicting in any way with the laws of the land.

As a matter of fact almost every form of association, churches, lodges, literary societies, clubs and associations of every conceivable character, do make rules for their own guidance, without which they could hardly exist. The penalty for a violation of these rules is generally a reprimand or censure, a fine or suspension, and, in extreme cases, expulsion from membership. In enforcing these rules great care must be observed that the assembly proceeds according to Parliamentary Law and the rules themselves.

While it is within the power of a deliberative body to adopt rules that may conflict with general Parliamentary Law, yet when these rules are once adopted they cannot be ignored or set aside except according to parliamentary forms. For instance, if a body has a rule requiring all officers to be elected by ballot, and another providing that no rule, or this particular one, should not be suspended except on previous notice and by a three-fourths vote, unless such a notice had been given and the rule suspended by the majority mentioned, the election in any other manner except by ballot would be illegal and would not be sustained in a suit at law.

Library of Congress

General Parliamentary Law attaches to and governs every deliberative body the moment it comes into existence. All writers on Parliamentary Law do not agree, so it is the usual custom for all organizations to formally adopt some work on the subject as a guide.

To illustrate: It would be in order for a member of any organization to move “that we adopt Witham's ‘Easy Lessons in Parliamentary Law’ as our guide.” Should this motion prevail, this little booklet would be the final authority on all matters not covered and determined by the special rules of the organization. And this would be time even though other writers on the subject radically differed with the author.

208

2. It is a question, or matter of the highest privilege, to enforce the rules. Any member has an undoubted right at any time, except when a vote is being taken, to rise to a point of order and insist on the enforcement of a rule, and the presiding officer has no choice but to enforce the same, unless on motion the operation of said rule be suspended. A motion to suspend a rule should include the length of time and for what purpose.

3. In general all rules affecting only members may be suspended by a democratic body, but not by a delegate or representative body, by unanimous consent.

Congress has no power to suspend any rule based on the Constitutional of the United States, nor has a Legislature any power to suspend a rule to carry out some provision of a State Constitution.

At town or school meeting of voters is a democratic body. A town or city council or a school board is a representative body.

Congress makes provision for the suspension of its own rules that do not conflict with the National Constitution, and State Legislatures do likewise in respect to the rules that are not in conflict with State Constitutions.

Library of Congress

Each house of Congress is the judge of the election returns and qualification of its own members, and any rule adopted to carry out this provision could not be suspended in any manner.

On the passage of any law by a State Legislature the names of all members voting for or against must be entered on the journal.

Bills that are to become laws must be read on three separate days before final action.

Where the words, “read in full,” are not used, to save time, the presiding officer, by unanimous consent, directs that the bills be read a first, and sometimes a second, time by their titles only, which is often done—I might say almost universally. In a certain Legislature, on the final or third reading, just before the passage of a very long bill, when only a part had been read, a member arose and moved that the further reading be dispensed with.

The speaker ruled that this could not be done by a “recorded motion,” that it could only be done by unanimous consent, and the part read taken for the whole and the record or journal of the proceedings must show that the bill was read the third time. He held further, that if the Constitution provided that the bill 209 must be a read *in full* that every lines must be read and the journal must so state. After considerable debate the position if the speaker was sustained.

4. Many business associations, especially of farmers, are operating under charters, or articles of incorporation, and managed by a board of directions, who in turn transfer their authority to a few of their number, usually styled an executive committee.

To avoid all trouble any rule that may be adopted to carry out any of the provisions of these articles, which in any way affect the rights or the privileges of individual stockholders, should be rigidly observed by the directors. Rules, however, merely incidental to the business may be suspended. For example: Suppose a farmers' elevator

Library of Congress

company should provide “that any complaint or dissatisfaction must be filed in writing with the board or managers within two weeks after the transaction that gave rise to the complaint occurred.”

It would be clearly within the power and authority of this board, providing the matter had not been covered in the articles of incorporation, to waive or suspend this rule in whole or in part.

They might consider the complaint, though not presented till a month or more had elapsed, or they might hear the aggrieved party orally.

5. No rule should be suspended without the concurrence of at least two-thirds of all the active members present, and a special rule of every deliberative assembly should so provide.

In literary societies, not incorporated, operating under a constitution and by-laws, the rule might apply to both.

In a farmer's club, where the constitution confined the membership exclusively to “practical and operative farmers,” a person not a farmer applied and it was held that unanimous consent was necessary. In another case, where the constitution limited the delegates from the club to active farmers, it was held that the rule could not be suspended at all.

It is clear to the author that any rule or provision of a constitution should be suspended by the consent of *all* the members, but it is not so obvious that the power should be lodged in the members who happen to attend one particular meeting or session, without notice at all the members. If this were allowable it would be possible for a minority faction to take the control of an organization away from the undisputed majority, or expel every member of that majority!

So it would seem that the better rule would be to either give to every member a formal notice of an intention to suspend some provision of a constitution a reasonable time in advance of the meeting, or require the consent of all the members to such suspension, bearing in mind that it is the object and purpose of Parliamentary Law to facilitate the transaction of business with a due regard for the rights and privilege of all, and author can reach no other conclusion.

211

CHAPTER X MISCELLANEOUS MATTERS

1. Quorum —It is of course necessary in any assembly or gathering meeting at fixed or stated times to determine the number in attendance necessary for the transaction of business. A date for each meeting is usually fixed by the rules or named by a previous meeting. Ordinarily the presence of a majority of all the members on the roll would be required, but a hard and fast rule of this nature would sometimes work a hardship. For instance, if a farmers' club has 100 members and by reason of bad weather only 40 were present, should these be required to go home without holding a meeting or doing anything? Obviously this should not be required of them. So by a special rule a less number than a majority should be named.

In some clubs some actual number, say 10 or 20, and not a certain per cent is required.

In smaller, and especial in representative bodies, the case is different. To safeguard the rights and interests of all not only should a majority of the board be required to be present, but no business should be legal that did not have the sanction of a majority. Suppose a board should consist of 17 members, 9 of which would be a majority and would therefore make a quorum. A majority of these, that is 5, would rule in an ordinary meeting.

This board, as may readily be seen, could split up into three almost equal factions, each of which under certain conditions could be in control.

Library of Congress

This condition of affairs must necessarily lead to trouble and not infrequently to lawsuits.

This could be guarded against by a simple rule requiring an affirmative vote of at least nine of the seventeen, so that what had once been decided upon could not be undone, unless someone of the majority should change his mind, when by joining with the other eight, he would make that side the majority.

2. Breaking a Quorum —It is the privilege, and may sometimes be the duty, of minority members of a board to prevent some high-handed or ill-advised proceeding to “break the quorum.” They 212 do this, with or without notice, by simply retiring from the rooms in which the meeting may be held.

There is no way by which they can be legally restrained from taking this course. Indeed any attempt even to restrain them is a serious criminal offense. If doors should be locked a demand that they be opened should be made, and if this demand be not immediately complied with, then the doors may be broken down by force, using only so much violence as may be necessary to effect the object.

As a matter of precaution, when a member takes this action, he should first file with the president or secretary, in writing, or at least make the statement orally,, “I hereby give notice at this hour [naming the time] that I withdraw from this meeting,” signing his name if in writing.

In such cases all business transacted after the withdrawal becomes null and void to take effect the instant the parties retire. Legal business stops, event though the announcement of the result of a vote in process of being taken is only needed to complete it.

However, if the vote has actually been taken and ascertained before the minority leaves, even though the result has not been announced, some authorities hold it is valid.

Library of Congress

If it be not necessary for all the minority to depart in order to break the quorum it is better to leave one member present to keep tab in subsequent proceedings, be a witness, or object to further doings where unanimous consent may be required.

3. Motions in Writing —The chairman of a meeting may require all motions, and especially all amendments, to be reduced to writing. The secretary, however, if they are short, generally takes them down as they are made. Should the chairman make this request, it should be cheerfully complied with, as he would be clearly within his rights.

In putting the motion in writing say, "Motion [amendment or resolution as the case may be] by [John Smith, that is, giving the name.] This is done so that the matter may be traced to its author, and to avoid confusion and the mixing up of motions that may be on the secretary's table.

4. Stating the Question —All questions submitted for decision should be clearly stated by the chair. It is hardly sufficient to merely say as many chairmen do, "You have heard the question, all who are in favor will say "aye" etc." This may be allowable if the proposition is very short and simple. But it is 213 generally better in the long run for the chairman to restate the question clearly and distinctly that everyone present fully understands the matter and can vote intelligently

5. Following Forms —It is highly important that the forms of putting motions prescribed by parliamentary writers be closely followed. For example: When an appeal is taken from the decision of the chair the proper form for putting the question is, "Shall the decision of the chair stand as the judgment of the house?" [club or any name by which the organization may be known]. "Shall the decision of the chair be reversed or overruled?" is not a proper form, and is not used by good parliamentarians.

6. The Previous Question —While a study of the previous question as used in legislative bodies and other deliberative assemblies throughout the world is very interesting, yet it is

Library of Congress

sufficient to know that here in America it is now generally invoked for just one purpose—to suppress debate. When a two-thirds majority of an assembly has heard all the talk on a subject it desires or is willing to listen to it is clearly its right to head off further discussion by some long-winded orator who may be talking to no purpose or simply against time. To do this someone obtains the floor, as stated elsewhere, and simply says, “I demand the previous question.” The chairman must at once put the matter before the house, explaining if desired the effect of the motion. If two-thirds of those voting second the previous question, debate instantly ceases, and a vote must be taken on whatever is pending.

The demand may be restricted. That is, if an amendment is pending the mover may say, “I demand the previous question *on the amendment*.” But if not so restricted it applies to everything before the house.

7. Debated — *Cannot be Amended*. There are some few motions that can neither be debated nor amended. The principal of these are as follows:

Demand for the previous question.

To lay on the table.

An appeal from the decision of the chair relating to indecorum.

A division of the assembly.

Leave to consider speaking after being ruled out of order.

Objection to considering a question.

A question of order.

A parliamentary inquiry.

Library of Congress

A question of privilege.

214

Permission to read papers.

To suspend the rules.

To take from the table.

Take up a question out of its order.

Leave to withdraw a motion.

It might be well to commit this list to memory.

7. Cannot be Debated —The following, in addition to the above, are not debatable:

Adjourn (when privilege).

A simple motion to limit or extend debate.

A call for the division of a question.

To close or reopen nominations.

Motions that relate to voting.

When an assembly has fixed a time when it shall meet either by standing rule or by special order the simple motion to adjourn would be “privileged,” otherwise it would not.

For instance, a motion to adjourn till 10 o'clock tomorrow would not be privileged. It could be debated and amendments would be in order to strike out “10” and insert some other

Library of Congress

hour and also to name some other date instead of “tomorrow,” and to “take a recess” instead of adjourning.

8. Reconsideration —Many questions, provided the motion is made at the same or the next meeting, may be reconsidered, provided the motion be made by one who voted on the prevailing side.

The following, however, are not subject to reconsideration:

1. A simple motion to adjourn.
2. The adoption or amendment of a constitution and by-laws.
3. To commit, recommittee or refer.
4. Any division of an assembly or question.
5. To make or close nominations.
6. To lay on the table.
7. Motion to suspend rules.
8. To take from the table.
9. An affirmative motion to lay on the table.